DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 763 VT 010 237

AUTHOR	Somers, Gerald G.; And Others
TITLE	The Training and Placement of Older Workers: An Evaluation of Four Community Projects.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Council on the Aging, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 67
NOTE	214p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC-$10.80
DESCRIPTORS	Counseling, *Demonstration Projects, *Evaluation, Job Placement, *Older Adults, On the Job Training, Tables (Data), *Unemployed, *Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS	Baltimore, Boston, Buncombe County, Milwaukee, North Carolina

ABSTRACT

The major objective of this study was to examine the experience of four projects in Baltimore, Boston, Milwaukee, and Buncombe County, North Carolina in counseling and placing in jobs older hard-core unemployed workers. Originally the programs were designed to train the hard-core unemployed over 50 years of age. Generally the emphasis was changed from on-the-job training to counseling, job development and placement, and from selecting the most disadvantaged to selecting the least disadvantaged in the over-50 age group. There was little evidence that the program provided significant economic gains in employment or income, even though the participants expressed the opinion that they were pleased with the various programs. (BC)

THE TRAINING AND PLACEMENT OF OLDER WORKERS:
AN EVALUATION OF FOUR COMMUNITY PROJECTS

ED035763

Prepared for the
National Council on the Aging
and
The Manpower Administration
U. S. Department of Labor

Principal Investigator: Gerald G. Somers

Co-Investigators: Juanita Kreps
Garth Mangum
Graeme McKechnie
Richard Perlman
David Taylor

CENTER FOR STUDIES IN TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

VT010237

This report was prepared under a contract with the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research, U.S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Persons undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

ED035763

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE TRAINING AND PLACEMENT OF OLDER WORKERS:
AN EVALUATION OF FOUR COMMUNITY PROJECTS

Prepared for the
National Council on the Aging
and
The Office of Manpower Policy Evaluation and Research
U. S. Department of Labor

Principal Investigator: Gerald G. Somers

Co-Investigators: Juanita Kreps
Garth Mangum
Graeme McKechnie
Richard Perlman
David Taylor

The University of Wisconsin

September, 1967

CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION — Gerald Somers — 1

II. EVALUATION OF OLDER WORKER PROJECTS

Baltimore — Garth Mangum — 7

Boston — David Taylor — 56

Buncombe County, N.C. — Juanita Kreps — 124

Milwaukee — Richard Perlman — 165

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS — Gerald Somers and Graeme McKechnie — 191

APPENDIX

Worker Questionnaire

Employer Questionnaire

INTRODUCTION

On January 23, 1967, President Johnson delivered a message to the Congress on older Americans in which he urged renewed efforts to further the employment of older workers. This goal was to be achieved through action against discrimination and through a variety of improved employment services. The President's exhortation followed the 1966 amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act which also called for special counselling, training and placement services for older workers.

This report evaluates four community efforts to obtain employment for hard-core unemployed workers over 50 years of age. The community projects differed in approach and techniques, and frequently the approach and techniques actually adopted differed from those initially planned. However, the projects taken as a whole provide a basis for evaluating testing, counselling, training and placement services along the lines espoused by the President and in the M.D.T.A. amendments.

The older worker projects were carried out by specialized agencies in Baltimore, Boston, Milwaukee and Buncombe County, North Carolina. Funds were provided by the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research* to each of the community agencies. Separate funds were provided by OMPER in a contractual arrangement with the National Council on the Aging. The N.C.O.A. provided services and supervision for the community agencies, and they were administratively responsible to N.C.O.A. However, N.C.O.A. officials felt that the funding arrangement weakened their control over the individual projects. This report also appraises the effectiveness of this administrative approach to experimental and demonstration employment programs for older workers.

The Case for Special Efforts

The recent amendments to the M.D.T.A. were designed to correct an obvious underrepresentation of older workers in Federal retraining programs. In 1966 more than one-fourth of the unemployed were 45 and over, but only 10 percent of all M.D.T.A. trainees were in this older age category. Even a smaller percentage of older workers were enrolled in on-the-job training programs, a form of training that will be increasingly emphasized by M.D.T.A. officials in coming years. Since older workers suffer a disproportionate share of long-term unemployment and have relatively fewer years to recoup a training investment, both employers and training programs are prone to pass them by.

---

*Then called the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training.

Like the regular M.D.T.A. programs, the various facets of the war on poverty emphasize youth rather than age. And yet older persons and families headed by older persons constitute a substantial proportion of the poor. Even the Work Experience and Training Program (Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act), designed to increase the employability of public assistance recipients and other needy persons, includes only a little more than 10 percent of workers over 50 among its participants. Title V is one of the very few O.E.O. programs that could be expected to include older workers. It is the one which comes closest to the community projects evaluated in this report.

In spite of exhortations and legislative amendments, increased employment for older workers will not be readily accomplished. There is not likely to be a marked early improvement in the percentage participation of older workers in regular M.D.T.A. and O.E.O. programs. The obstacles lie not only in the adverse attitudes of employers, reflected in the selection criteria of the employment service; but just as fundamentally in the attitudes and motivation of the older workers themselves. Belbin found motivational factors to be of key importance in his comprehensive international review of the literature on older-worker training programs prepared for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in 1965. In their extensive survey of labor market adjustments of the unemployed, Sobel and Folk found that "the proportion of persons with no interest in retraining was much higher among older workers than among younger workers." Studies at the University of Wisconsin indicate that older workers are even much less aware of the opportunity and availability of retraining programs for the unemployed.

As Belbin and others have shown, intensive counselling is required to restore the confidence and increase the awareness of older workers, especially among the long-term unemployed, as a prerequisite to their labor-market rehabilitation. But the reluctance of many unemployed older workers to apply for employment-oriented service programs is rooted in their knowledge of the realities of the labor market. The experience of their peers gives justification to fears that they may fare poorly in the selection process; and if accepted, that their employment and income may not be appreciably improved. Thus, even on the score of motivation, vigorous efforts to improve selection techniques and ultimate placement ratios are essential.

The Challenge and Response

If it is clear that special efforts are required to restore the employability of displaced older workers, it is not so clear that a successful formula has been discovered. The specialized literature on this subject stresses the opportunities, but the results are a perplexing mixture of victories and defeats. Studies indicate that older workers can be motivated through specialized counselling stressing awareness and the restoration of confidence and initiative; that their skills can be enhanced through a modification of customary training techniques, with a new emphasis on activity rather than memory and on a relaxed pace rather than time constraints; that employers can be induced to open up training opportunities and jobs if a suitable approach is made on behalf of the older worker.

However, the notable success stories have seldom included the hard-core unemployed. Most of the victories are scored by programs designed to upgrade or facilitate the transfer of older workers who are already employed. Even when a training program is directed at the unemployed, as in the M.D.T.A. or our surveys in West Virginia, the reasonably high placement ratios for older workers often reflect other, more favorable, characteristics. It is frequently found that the most successful older trainees have higher educational levels or a sounder previous skill base than the average. There is little evidence, as yet, that hard-core unemployed older workers can be restored to employment security, especially when low education or racial factors compound their labor-market disadvantages.

Demonstration Projects

Although the nation has apparently accepted the announced goal of increased employment for older workers, it is unlikely that the drive in this direction can be sustained without some demonstration of positive results. If resources devoted to this end produce very meager benefits in employment and income, or if the costs of employment rehabilitation are very high relative to benefits, pressure will emerge for income maintenance schemes rather than employment creation.

Even if it should be accepted that hard-core unemployed workers over 50 can be returned to secure employment, the question remains as to the most effective techniques. Is retraining for such workers a sound investment? Or should emphasis be placed on direct placement activities and work experience? How important are selection procedures and counselling? An economic evaluation of programs for older workers is not--and probably should not--dislodge us from our nationally-determined goal of older worker employment, but it can play its principal role in defining the most efficient techniques for achievement of that goal.

Because regular programs designed to increase employment are prone to by-pass older workers, special demonstration projects provide a necessary vehicle for effective action as well as research evaluation. Earlier demonstration projects have been geared primarily to the problems of youth, but the 1966 amendments to M.D.T.A. encourage such programs for unemployed older workers. Several are now under way, to test community administrative procedures, counselling techniques and a variety of employment and placement services. Unfortunately, many demonstration projects provide less effective lessons than they might because they have not been followed by a careful research evaluation. Even when this is later initiated, it is frequently found that the requisite records and data have not been collected or preserved. The evaluations reported here have not fully escaped from these pitfalls.

N.C.O.A. Project Evaluations

The N.C.O.A. older worker projects in four communities were designed to test and demonstrate the types of techniques discussed above. The projects were established to increase employment opportunities for unemployed older workers through a variety of procedures. They were not set up for a research evaluation, and "picking up the pieces" after the fact created inevitable problems of access to data, workers, employers and community officials.

Since each project had its peculiar configuration in spite of common initial goals, the research approach in each community also had its own peculiarities. The eminent community research investigators had their own views concerning the most effective mode of inquiry, given the nature of the project and the availability of data and research resources. Nonetheless, there was a major effort to establish some common lines of investigation so that cross-community comparisons could be made. Through a series of meetings, common questionnaires were adopted for gaining information from workers and employers; and common guidelines were utilized in shaping the questions to be asked of community administrators. Details of the research methodology are included in each of the separate community evaluations.

In the remainder of this report, each of the community evaluations constitutes a separate chapter, and the final chapter provides a summary analysis as well as some general conclusions to be derived from the comparative investigation.

We were especially fortunate to obtain the researfh expertise of highly qualified scholars in this field for each of the community investigations. Garth Mangum, research Professor of Economics at George Washington University, conducted the evaluation of the Baltimore project; David Taylor, Assistant Professor at The Alfred P. Sloan School of Management, M.I.T., evaluated the Boston Project; Juanita Kreps, Director of Undergraduate Studies in the Department of Economics and Business Administration at Duke University, carried out the investigation in Buncombe County, North Carolina; and Richard Perlman, chairman of the Department of Economics at the University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee, is author of the Milwaukee evaluation. None of these should be held responsible for ideas expressed and generalizations offered in the final chapter.

As is indicated in the authorship of the final chapter, I am indebted to Professor Graeme McKechnie for his assistance at all stages of this research. I am also grateful to Mrs. Pauline Fosdick for her unfailing aid. To the National Council on The Aging, especially Norman Sprague, and OMPER go my thanks for this opportunity to make what is hoped to be a useful contribution to the study of older workers.

Gerald G. Somers

THE OLDER WORKER PROJECT IN BALTIMORE

by

Garth Mangum

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
A. INTRODUCTION	8
B. THE PROJECT	9
C. CLIENT SERVICES	22
D. THIRD QUARTER 1966 - FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWING	28
E. NOT PLACED EXPERIENCE	40
F. OWP COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS	43
G. EMPLOYER SURVEY	44
H. CONCLUSION	45
I. APPENDIX	48

Evaluation of the Baltimore Older Worker's Project

A. INTRODUCTION

The Baltimore On-the-Job Training Program for Workers over Fifty, more commonly known as the Older Worker's Project (OWP) was a Labor Department financed Experimental and Demonstration Project to develop employment for workers over 50 years of age in the Baltimore area. The Program was originally structured to provide subprofessional on-the-job training positions generally in health, education, welfare, recreation, urban renewal and other related community service agencies which did not specifically compete with openings sought by younger workers. There were two implied assumptions, (1) that employed older workers were a homogeneous group who because of their age, would be willing to accept jobs which were vacant primarily because they offered low pay and status and (2) that the agencies could be persuaded by the underwriting of training costs to hire the older workers. Neither of these assumptions proved valid.

The original Project hypothesis was revised two times. When the original intent failed, the Program was redirected to a search for employment opportunities within the business and industrial community in addition to the community service agencies. During this second phase, the Project lost much of its experimental and demonstration emphasis, thus requiring a further revision to make the Project a meaningful developmental activity.

The third Project phase attempted to test whether third party intervention on behalf of unemployed workers whose only substantial handicap was having passed the half-century mark could assist them in their job search activities. The Program included extensive job counselling and job referral with Project staff preparing the way with employers.

With the benefit of hindsight, several questions are raised concerning the design and administration of the Project. The National Council on the Aging (NCOA) was chosen to act as a developmental contractor for the selection of local agencies in five cities to administer projects designed to expand services for older workers. In Baltimore the Health and Welfare Council (HWC) was chosen and made responsible for negotiating a direct contract with the Office of Manpower Policy Evaluation and Research (OMPER)* but conceptually NCOA was expected to provide technical assistance both in program formulation and operations because of its assumed expertise. However, NCOA gave relatively little guidance to the OWP staff until the final Project phase and there is no evidence of any special insight into older worker problems or reactions.

The OWP staff was dedicated but inexperienced and much of the year passed in learning unfamiliar technical tasks such as counselling and job development. The purpose of the Project was never clear. If the purpose were an experiment to test whether older workers could be placed in on-the-job training positions in public service agencies, the project lacked the rudimentary elements of experimental design. If the purpose were demonstration, there should have been more prior consideration of what would be demonstrated. The assumptions of homogeneity and willingness to accept low status and poorly paid employment could have been subjected to pretesting. The basis question appears never to have been asked: "Is there something unique about age which makes it more significant than other characteristics in determining the appropriate treatment of a group of workers?"

B. THE PROJECT

1. Origin and Description of the Older Worker Project (OWP)

The Baltimore Project began as a joint planning effort by the NCOA and OMPER. NCOA was commissioned for a demonstration project involving six cities each studying a different problem of the older worker and the Baltimore Commission on Aging was contacted concerning the possibility of including Baltimore as one of the test sites. In the fall of 1963 the Health and Welfare Council (HWC) was asked to function as the operating agency for carrying out the Baltimore activity. After it was agreed that the HWC would operate the program, that agency proceeded to develop a project hypothesis and negotiated the necessary contract with OMPER. Feasibility studies were not conducted on the proposal although several meetings were held with persons and agencies on the practicality of the suggested program including the local Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training and the Maryland State Employment Service. In addition, several hospitals representing the community service agencies of the type which would ultimately provide needed job opportunities were consulted and a consensus was reached on the general applicability of the project.

---

*Then designated Office of Manpower, Automation and Training.

The OWP contract outlined three priority responsibilities: "(1) OJT development, (2) Pre-placement counselling and placement, (3) Continued counselling, training, education, and other required services." It was the second component of two related activities designed to assist displaced and unemployed workers in the Baltimore area. At least 200 workers over 50 were to be referred from Component I of the project, the Job Counseling and Referral Clinic Project (JCC),* for the purpose of being placed in sub-professional skilled and unskilled on-the-job training activities. In determining possible training situations emphasis was to be given to community service agencies for jobs which were "especially appropriate for older workers and not competitive with youth, because they may hold little promise for long-range advancement and career making."

The Project was originally intended to include a three-month planning and staffing phase from October through December, 1964. However, HWC was

*See Appendix for description of project.

unable to find a qualified director. Therefore, it gave one of its own employees a year's leave of absence and assigned him the task. The Project became operative on January 4, 1965 with only three, of a projected eight, on its professional staff. Steps were taken to fill the remaining staff positions at the same time efforts of the on-board staff members were directed to finding training opportunities, employment openings, and processing a backlog of employment searching applicants who had been badgering the parent HWC office from the day the contract authorizing the Project was announced in the local news media.

Interim staff progress reports indicate the most pressing concern was the necessity of placing clients in job opportunities. the HWC staff man who prepared the Project proposal (and incidentally claimed he was never consulted by the staff operating the OWP) suggested that much of the OJT training envisioned was of a broad informal type rather than specific contracts negotiated through federal manpower agencies. Though job placement was the ultimate justifiable goal, this philosophy tended to relegate training to a subordinate position even though it was of first priority contractually.

During this first phase, job development was limited exclusively to nonprofit community service agencies. Although numerous jobs and applicants were processed by an expanding OWP staff there was nearly a complete rejection by the applicants of the menial low paying and low status jobs made available. At the same time, the training subsidies proved unattractive to the public administrators who were willing to meet their training needs at their own expense if applicants were available. The staff recognized the futility of this limited approach and in February expressed a need to expand job development activities to the business and industrial community.

1c

Neither was staff morale strengthened by the failure to fill its ranks (the final job counselor did not report until March 29) and the resignation of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee after its first meeting. In resigning he said the OWP, as it was presently structured, would result in increased unemployment in the community and could only provide marginal employment opportunities for older workers.

In March, OMPER permission was obtained to expand job development to business and industry and beginning April 1 the second phase of the project became operative. For the first time active recruitment of applicants for employment was attempted. Prior to this applicants had come because of (1) general public announcements about the project, (2) in response to appeals for employer assistance to provide jobs, and (3) in response to TV and radio announcements about OWP activities which originated from a source unknown to the Project.

The second phase was characterized by general job development and placement procedures similar to other employment services but generally limited to persons over 50. Between April 1 and July 31 the Project made over half of its direct placements but at the same time lost all semblance of an experimental and demonstration activity.

In July Miss Frances Schon of the NCOA staff consulted with the OWP staff. A subsequent staff report commented: "For the first time, Project staff has a sense of what it is about and how to go about it." (June-July Interim Report, page 9). This redirection not only resulted in the development of an E&D orientation for the OWP but also provided for the first meaningful cooperative relationship with the Maryland State Employment Service.

During the last five months of the year the OWP was designed to demonstrate that 50-60 year old workers whose only handicap was "age" could be placed by intensive individual placement counselling and job development procedures. Eligibility for OWP applicants was limited to 50-60 year olds who had no physical or mental handicaps and a long-term attachment to the labor force. Job development efforts with employers were directed to placing people in specifically solicited positions. An important program activity was the intervention of OWP specialists with employers who placed age restrictions on USES job orders thus demonstrating that employer attitudes could be altered if he were presented with a qualified person beyond the age range he initially requested.

Through November (December and subsequent data not available) the OWP reported MSES forwarded information on 193 job orders of which 126 contained age restrictions. The OWP followed up on 67 of these orders 38 of which denied any age bias. Subsequently job interviews were arranged for 21 applicants and three were hired. The remaining jobs in which Project applicants were placed resulted from the independent job development activities of the OWP staff.

2. Project Staff

The professional staff of the OWP included the Director, an Administrative Assistant, two Job Specialists and three Job Counselors. A projected group counselor position was never filled because of the relationship with Component I, the group counselling activity.

When the Project began, one job specialist and the three job counselors were yet to be hired. Although several good prospects tentatively accepted OWP offers they subsequently found more desirable positions and did not report for work. The full complement of professional staff was not filled until March 29 when the last job counselor reported to the Project.

Although the general caliber of the OWP staff was good, none of them had any significant experience in job development, employment counselling, or the specific problems of the older worker. A comment in the OWP's Job Counseling Report is illuminating.

> The fact that the people who designed the Project and the people who are attempting to execute it had such limited experience in the field of employment has not added to the effectivenss of the demonstration process. The idea that persons with little or no training and experience in a particular field can, in the space of a few months, add significantly to the knowledge of that field is somewhat paradoxical. Yet, this is the position in which the Project has found itself. (Special Job Counseling Report, page 1).

Another problem was the comparative youth of the job counselling staff as compared to the clientele they served. During interviewing for the current evaluation, an objection of several people was despite the fine reception and attention given them by OWP job counselors, "those young people just didn't understand the problems of we older folks." Some of these allegations can be attributed to the eccentricities of age but then again a more mature counselling staff may have possibly been better received and particularly had they possessed a more thorough knowledge of job counselling techniques.

3. Agency Coordination

During the development stage of the OWP discussions were held with several agencies on the general feasibility of the program. After the project was initiated additional meetings were held with various groups to implement the Project's activities. Unfortunately, much of the support proffered in these early meetings was never backed by real action.

The Community Service agencies were willing to provide their usual array of employment positions but one of the major findings of the report was they were unwilling to "alter staffing patterns in order to create sub-professional occupation which might have been suitable to the employment needs of older workers." Perhaps some of this resistance could have been overcome but the current year's programs were already committed administratively and financially and the short duration of the OWP made it impossible to overcome these obstacles.

A more serious problem developed in the OWP's relations with the Maryland State Employment Service. A limited number of referrals were made in the Project's early life but no continuing relationship was established until August either for client referral or job development. In fact, early attempts to obtain the names of registered MSES applicants over 50 or permission to interview older workers whose unemployment compensation eligibility was about to expire were both rebuffed.

Early Project reports express a sense of accomplishment in being able to develop jobs without the assistance of other employment agencies and may partially explain the Project's reluctance to push MSES relations. However, there appears to be an unnecessary duplication of effort in this approach and this coupled with the inexperience of the OWP staff suggests a considerable inefficiency that could have been alleviated through a cooperative OWP-MSES relationship as it existed in the final project operation. From the beginning, OWP applicants who were not in the Employment Service's active file were required to register with the MSES before receiving Project services.

The OWP had good relations with the Baltimore Public Welfare Department partially illustrated in that this was the only agency which sponsored an OJT program. A referral procedure and applicant interviewing program also was operated. In the event OWP applicants needed income maintenance assistance the OWP referred them to the Welfare Agency. During the Project's life the state Vocational Rehabilitation Agency was also involved in this type of cross fertilization of services.

Relations with the JCC, Component I, of the Project were less productive than they might have been. Formalized referral procedures were not established until the third Project phase. Through the end of July only 28 referrals had originated from this source. During the third phase, however, OWP staff met with JCC Counseling groups during the first of the six sessions provided clients and offered OWP assistance to qualified individuals. The job counselors also recommended that OWP applicants avail themselves of the JCC services as a part of their overall counselling activity. The final report indicates 72 people were referred from JCC but it does not tell us how many additional OWP applicants took advantage of JCC group counselling services.

Relations with training-oriented agencies were either nonexistent or considerably frustrating. No meaningful associations were instituted with Vocational Education but this is understandable because of the OJT orientation of the project. Although several attempts were made to get OWP applicants referred to MDTA courses they all ended in frustration. Ostensive reasons given for the lack of MDTA support were inapplicability of courses, inadequate client qualifications, and excessive referrals from other sources; but OWP staff indicated they felt more training slots could have been filled by OWP applicants had MDTA administrators been more willing to cooperate.

During its early life the OWP apparently felt a keen sense of satisfaction in being able to "go it alone" in its job development and recruiting activities. Unfortunately, this independent attitude probably resulted in a less effective program during the first two phases than might have otherwise been the case. The Project would certainly have been more meaningful had the operations carried out during the third Project phase been extant in earlier periods and perhaps this would have been possible had there been a closer NCOA relationship. In retrospect it would have seemed advisable for NCOA, as long as it has the contracts, to have either directly operated the Project or at least been intimately involved from the beginning.

4. Training Experience

The interim reports indicate an early emphasis on job development and placement that appears to overshadow serious efforts in the establishment of OJT activities. Fifty-one health, education, and welfare agencies were approached but only one contract was finally negotiated.

The January project report outlined a tentative "dictaphone machine operator" course to be sponsored by the Baltimore City Department of Public Welfare. The course was delayed for nine months while technical contract difficulties were negotiated and finally started in September with six trainees. The instructor proved to be incapable of adequately motivating the enrolled trainees who in turn lacked sufficient education and background to meet program standards. During November and December a program evaluation determined the inadequacy of the instructor which resulted in her dismissal the last of December. After a futile search for a competent replacement the course was discontinued in mid-January. Two of the five then enrolled trainees were employed by the Welfare Department on a provisional basis.

All other efforts at initiating OJT contracts ended in frustration. State agencies indicated that monies received from OJT could not be used to supplement budgets but rather had to be returned to the general fund of the State Controller thus effectively overcoming any financial incentive offered. Then, too, staff requirements were already unalterably committed during the limited duration of the OWP contract. Other agencies reported that OJT training for contemplated OWP type positions were already operative and there was no justifiable need for OWP monies. Several hospitals were willing to accept OWP applicants but the available positions were inappropriate because of excessive physical demands, commuting distance, undesirable hours, low pay, etc.

OWP training programs were equally unattractive to business and industry. Several hundred letters were mailed to these institutions requesting participation and nearly 150 follow-up phone calls were made. The response was universally negative. Despite Project staff efforts to overcome a variety of employer objections concerning negative effects on company benefit programs, inability to select potential trainees, etc.; there was a strong feeling voiced by these companies that the $25 maximum allowance was insufficient to compensate them for anticipated problems and they preferred to do their own training foregoing outside contracts.

5. Job Development Activities

One of the contractural elements of the OWP was a self-evaluation of its experience with job development. As originally outlined, the Job Development Report was to describe the Project's ability to influence employers in restructuring staff patterns for the development of new sub-professional employment opportunities for older workers. In addition, the report was to discuss the procedures utilized in overcoming administrative difficulties in developing OJT openings and finally the report was to describe its placement procedures for older workers in relation to their prior work experience and present interests.

The Project was unable to demonstrate measurable success in accomplishing the first two criteria. The Project's short operation period precluded any substantial effort in the development of new jobs by altering staffing patterns and a wide range of previously described problems relegated the OWP training program to an ineffectual "one-shot" affair.

In the final analysis the OWP was little more than a specialized employment agency catering to a more mature clientele. One of the more significant contributions made by the Project was its intervention with employers in behalf of job searching workers and during its existence the Project became increasingly sophisticated in providing this service.

At first job development was limited to a general job search primarily for unskilled positions in public and private nonprofit community service agencies. During the Project's first phase 363 jobs were developed with 13 people actually placed. The four percent placement record resulted in considerable consternation both within the staff and among participating employers who expected more qualified referrals from the agency.

In the next Project phase a continued general job development procedure was utilized but the emphasis shifted to more skilled positions within the business and industrial community. About three-fifths of the jobs developed were in private business whereas nearly seven-eighths of the jobs developed in the first phase were in the nonprofit sector. The proportion of placements to jobs developed also increased significantly from four to 10 percent between the two phases.

The third Project phase witnessed a final shift in job development procedures. The general job search was replaced by specific job development designed to present employers with directly qualified personnel for positions they were seeking to fill. After an OWP client had proceeded through a counselling and evaluation procedure the OWP job specialists would intervene with employers who had advertised for positions requiring the talents possessed by the client.

The specific job development was marked by a continuing emphasis on semi-skilled and skilled positions within the business community.

Four out of five jobs developed were in business and industry and the proportions of skilled and semi-skilled positions increased from 45 percent in phase one to 85 percent in phase three.

Characteristics of Jobs Developed by the Project

	Phase I		Phase II		Phase III	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	363		523		322	
Public Nonprofit	149	41	145	28	8	3
Private Non-profit	154	42	68	13	60	18
Business & Industry	60	17	310	59	254	79
Skilled	69	19	85	16	132	41
Semi-skilled	95	26	320	61	143	44
Unskilled	199	55	118	22	47	15
Total placements	13	4*	53	10*	37	11*

* Proportion of placements to jobs developed

Substantive data indicating the relative effectiveness of specific versus general job development techniques is unavailable within the Project's experience. There is some evidence that the Project became increasingly efficient in placing individuals during the latter part of the Project life. There are also several success stories cited in case history material. However, it is important to remember that the proportion of placements to job developed remained essentially at the same level during the last two phases even though the labor market provided more employment opportunities and the caliber of workers was "less disadvantaged" during the third phase.

The following table indicates the employment experience of third phase Direct and Indirect placements by comparing the jobs they held just prior to OWP contact with those either obtained for them by the Project or which they obtained themselves while associated with the Project.* As might be expected the wage levels of clients were generally lower in the jobs they obtained following OWP contact probably reflecting acceptance of re-entry wage levels following the buildup of seniority wages in their former positions. Indirect placements apparently were forced to take less skilled positions as a considerable proportion of skilled workers shifted to semi-skilled or unskilled positions. Direct placements, however, were characterized as elevating their job status although at the cost of assuming much lower wage rates. The important point is that neither the Direct or Indirect placement group indicated any significant differences in their experience to suggest the ability of the OWP to positively affect the employment experience of serviced clients.

Phase III Pre and Post OWP Contact Employment Experience

Direct and Indirect Placements

	Before			After		
	Number	Percent	Mean Wage $	Number	Percent	Mean Wage $
Direct						
Total	37	100	-	37	100	-
Skilled	8	22	1.90	14	38	1.37
Semi-skilled	21	56	1.85	14	38	1.61
Unskilled	8	22	1.21	9	24	1.32
Indirect						
Total	66	100	-	58	100	-
Skilled	27	41	2.54	16	28	2.84
Semi-skilled	34	51	1.77	31	53	1.62
Unskilled	5	8	1.57	11	19	1.20

*Throughout the remainder of the report numerous comparisons will be made of the experience of (1) Direct, (2) Indirect, and (3) Not place applicants. These terms apply to (1) OWP clients who were placed directly by the Project in employment positions, (2) individuals who obtained their own jobs while associated with the Project and (3) applicants who did not find employment while associated with the OWP. The tabular data above refer to the number of placements made in the phase and may include double counting of applicants who had more than one job.

Project staff reported a substantially better response from employers who were approached directly rather than through the mass media. Several mailing and radio-TV campaigns resulted in practically no job opportunities entering into the job file. Although on-site visits were more productive on a individual case basis, telephone contacting yielded the greatest overall efficiency and thus the largest proportion of direct employer contact. However, whenever an institution was considered a possible OJT contractor, on-site visit was considered mandatory.

C. CLIENT SERVICES

1. Intake and Referral

The OWP processed a total of 604 applicants or just over three-fifths of the 1000 originally anticipated. The 200 projected referrals from Component I were not realized as only 72 or 12 percent of the Project's applicants originated from this source.

During the first two phases the largest proportion of Project applicants originated from self-referral. There was no public request for applicants until a newspaper, radio, TV campaign was initiated in April; however, announcement of general Project activities and requests to employers for employment and training positions brought a large number of people seeking placement services even though in the latter case only a couple of isolated employers offered job openings.

A few referrals originated from MSES during the first two phases but during the third phase over half originated from this source. Both public and private community agencies such as the Welfare Department and the Over 60 Counseling Service supplied a steady proportion of applicants throughout the entire period. There were essentially no referrals made from the business and industrial community.

There were two separate operating techniques used in the selection of applicants for the OWP. During the first two phases any person over 50 who applied for assistance was generally accepted. However, the fact that third phase eligibility was limited to applicants between 50-60, without physical or mental disabilities, and with a labor force attachment of ten years presented one of the more interesting problems imposed on the job counseling staff i.e., the gleaning of ineligible persons counseled in the first two stages. These clients were referred to other public agencies such as Vocational Rehabilitation and the Over-60 Counselling Service as conditions warranted. Otherwise, they were dropped from the OWP rolls as gracefully as possible.

The OWP reported making 177 referrals to other community agencies. Seventy-seven percent were to the Maryland State Employment Service and 9 percent to the State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. The Department of Public Welfare received five percent and a variety of other agencies including the Over-60 Counselling Service 2 percent or less each.

2. Counselling and Related Activities

Beyond placement, the most significant service offerred OWP clients was counselling. It is interesting to note, however, that only 15 percent of individuals interviewed in the current survey acknowledged this service. This can be partially explained by definitional misunderstandings because every project client had at least one face-to-face interview with a job counselor and over half had two or more meetings.

An evolutionary character best describes the job counseling provided by the Project. None of the Project personnel had any direct experience in the job counseling field although one of the three job counselors had done some general counselling in his former work situation.

The Special Job Counselling Report recognizes the early difficulties undergone by the Project because of this dearth of pragmatic job counselling experience and cited steps taken to correct the problem.

During the early Project operations each counselor developed his own techniques without sufficient training or supervision. Unfortunately, the inexperience of the counselors proved a real problem as efforts were often directed to the resolution of client's personal and social problems rather than his employment needs. Early dialogues often read like soap opera scripts as counselors attempted to find out whether Mr. X really had been off his alcohol for six months; or a counselor expressed his dismay and frustration when a client failed to live up to his quickly drawn conclusions about the individual.

An illuminating experience occurred in February when an employer commented that the counselor who referred a man to him didn't know much about the individual's work potential. The counselor found he knew a considerable amount about the man's family and general attitudes but very little about his work experience and abilities.

As a result of these and other similar incidents the counselling program was reoriented with the emphasis placed on an objective analysis of the client's work experience and aptitudes including a verification of client statements with former employers. In addition, the counselors attempted to more thoroughly explore the real vocational potential and interests of the client by increasingly sophisticated counselling techniques.

The counselling program was further augmented by recommendations from Miss Schon during her July visit to the Project. She stressed the need for developing fundamental techniques of job counselling that had been proven by prior experience. The Project staff recognized its inability to perform the complex vocational counselling methods designed to assist clients in making major occupational changes. Rather the staff confined itself to job counselling, or assisting clients utilize their prior employment experience in finding employment, and making only minor adjustments as the situation required.

A major shift in counselling emphasis coincided with the revised Project operation of the third phase. During the first two phases counselors utilized the large number of job openings available to them and attempted to mold individual clients into the types employers desired. The emphasis was on placement, even if an individual were put into a position which suited neither his temperament or abilities. In the third phase the client's abilities, interests and desires were thoroughly analyzed and then job specialists and counselors worked together to place the client in a specific position solicited directly with an employer.

Throughout the course of the OWP a steady improvement in counselling technique was evident. Counselors became more objective and analytic in compiling case history material. Increased client participation in the process was evident as non-directive interviewing became more efficiently utilized. During later project stages, counselors utilized more sources of assistance in providing client services. All clients were advised to utilize "Component I" the group counselling facility. Clients were also advised to seek employment on their own and OWP staff members assisted them in preparing resumes.

Early experimentalization was conducted on varied combinations of job counselling -- job development coordination. At first the job counselors developed job opportunities for their individual clients while the job specialists solicited for the Project as a whole. However, additional experience proved a separation of function to be more effective. During the third phase a counselor would gather data for a client profile and determine an optimum employment position. The job counselor would then meet with the job specialist who would examine his file for an appropriate position and intervene with the employer on behalf of the client. The job specialist then provided the necessary details to the counselors who would call the client and inform him of the appointment.

As a part of their job counselling report the OWP staff suggested six criteria for effective placement of older workers: (1) A thorough exploration of the client's prior work experience, (2) An evaluation of current job interests including their relation to prior experiences, (3) An examination of the client's individual attempts to find employment and recommendations for improved techniques, (4) Extensive client-counselor inter-action to assist the former in making a realistic occupational choice, (5) Help the client in finding the type of employment he desires, properly caveated by appropriate limitations, rather than a job which just happens to be available and (6) make every effort to match prior work levels in responsibility and earnings or assist the client in adjusting to lower levels when necessary.

Despite the counselling staff's original inexperience in the field there was a considerable degree of expertise evidenced in the last Project phase. Case histories compiled in this final period often illustrate the effective utilization of techniques presented in the previous paragraph. Counselors and job specialists coordinated their efforts in scoring many successful placements some of which were with employers originally hesitant in hiring older workers.

3. Placement

The OWP did demonstrate an ability to place older workers some of whom may not have been employed without the substantial third-party intervention provided by the Project. However, the accomplishment of this objective involved a considerable allocation of time and personnel resources that was more than the level usually required for placement activities. In addition the procedures employed during the final phase of the Project require additional experience before an objective verification of results can be obtained.

A subjective appraisal of this program of intensive counselling followed by third-party intervention in the older worker employment search does appear promising. Unfortunately, the limited data available from the brief five-month experience in this effort does not conclusively demonstrate success. There is some evidence that the intensive counselling provided in the third phase did influence older workers as a greater proportion found employment through their own efforts. But, as previously noted, there was little indication of increased direct placement efficiency in the third phase as compared to the second.

About one-third of the applicants associated with the Project obtained employment. Fourteen percent, or 86 out of 604 clients, were placed directly by the Project in a total of 103 separate jobs. In addition, 110 or 18 percent, were given varying amounts of assistance but subsequently found employment on their own.

During a follow-up survey made by the Project in the first quarter of 1966 it was found that 53 percent of interviewed Direct placements were still employed on the job obtained for them. By contract 66 percent of the Indirect placements were still employed on jobs they had obtained themselves while associated with the OWP. Several persons in both Direct and Indirect categories had obtained other jobs so that at the time of follow-up about 75 and 85 percent, respectively, were employed.

In the follow-up study conducted in the third quarter of 1966, 70 percent of the Indirect placements and 69 percent of Direct placements were then employed. Thirty-one percent of the Direct placements were still in the Project referred positions and an estimated 45 percent of Indirect placements were in the job they obtained while associated with the Project.

D. THIRD QUARTER 1966 FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWING

1. Sampling Procedure

The sampling procedure was to pull every other person from the Direct and Indirect placements and every fourth applicant from the Not Placed category of the Project. The case file from which they were taken was arranged alphabetically and by phase. The results of the sample and the number of persons for which final surveys were completed was as follows:

	Sample Taken	Final Surveys Completed
Direct	43	29
Indirect	55	37
Not Placed	102	78
Total	200	144

About two-thirds of the Direct and Indirect samples were interviewed. A little over three-fourths of the Not Placed sample were interviewed. Therefore, there was a slight bias in favor of the applicants who had not been placed.

Interviewing began in the last few days of August on a face-to-face basis but proved so inefficient that a shift was made to the telephone, first from the OWP office in Baltimore and subsequently via a Washington-Baltimore direct line beginning in October.

During the survey extensive use was made of the OWP case files, with much of the demographic data obtained from that source and verified with the applicant. This procedure seemed to alleviate respondent hesitancy in the specific detailing of post-project experience requested.

Repeated call-backs were made at varying times during the day in order to complete the survey forms with two deviations from this procedure: (1) for those not having telephones the next person in the case file was selected, (2) for a brief period toward the end of the interviewing several names were pulled in a random fashion during one day. About 15 non-original sample persons were taken as a result of these two procedural deviations.

The following summary table indicates the demographic characteristics of the interviewed sample compared to the universe from which they were drawn.

Several observations concerning the original assumptions of group homogenity are appropriate here. Although many had less than a grammar school education there were several who had done graduate college work. Some applicants had never really been actively involved in the labor force whereas others had extensive employment histories. Skill levels varied from non-existent to skilled machinists to a retired corporation vice president.

There is a significantly greater proportion of women and persons over 65 included in the sample as compared to the OWP Universe with the latter discrepancy entirely explained by the under-representation of respondent applicants under 50. A much greater proportion also were classified as physically handicapped, however, the sample probably has

OWP Applicant Characteristics

	Universe		Sample	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	604		144	
Age:				
Less than 49	72	12	3	2
50-64	361	76	110	76
65 & over	71	12	31	22
Sex:				
Male	255	42	45	31
Female	349	58	99	69
Race:				
White	448	74	103	74
Negro	155	26	36	26
Marital Status:				
Single	61	10	12	8
Married	302	50	84	58
Separated	54	9	2	2
Divorced	66	11	18	13
Widowed	121	20	28	19
Education:				
0-8	101	17	18	13
9-11	244	40	60	42
12	192	32	43	30
College	67	11	23	16
Physically Handicapped:				
Yes	132	22	44	33
No	472	78	90	67

Demographic Characteristics
Sample of OWP Applicants
Interviewed Third Quarter 1961

Percentage by Placement Category

	Direct	Indirect	Not Placed
Number	29	37	78
Age:			
Under 49	3	3	1
50-64	83	83	71
65 and over	14	13	28
Sex:			
Male	31	33	31
Female	69	66	69
Race:			
White	78	72	74
Nonwhite	22	28	26
Marital Status:			
Married	55	73	54
Single	10	3	11
Widowed	17	14	24
Divorced	17	11	9
Separated	-	-	3
Education:			
Less than 8	14	8	14
8-11	45	41	41
12	24	32	31
College	17	19	14
Physically Handicapped:			
Yes	39	27	34
No	61	73	64

more serious definitional problems than does the universe in determining disability. To a lesser extent the sample has an over-representation of married people which is offset by an under-representation of separated individuals. Finally there is a greater proportion of post-high school education and fewer individuals with less than eight years of school, among the sample group.

The patterns evident between the placement categories of the sample are similar to those of the universe. Indirect placements clients generally had more representation among married men in the 50-60 age group and fewer people with an education of less than eight years.

2. Applicant Experiences and Attitudes

Currently Employed Cohort

Fifty-four percent of the sample were employed when interviewed, with a high of 70 percent among Indirect placements and a low of 42 percent among those Not Placed. Many of the currently unemployed had been employed since their OWP contact but 32 percent had been without work continuously since leaving the Project.

OWP client work experience since 1960 (five years preceding initiation of the Project) indicates about one-third had only held one job during the entire period. An additional 55 percent held two or more employment positions with the remaining group reporting no full-time employment during this period.

Returning to those currently working it was found that 77 percent were employed full-time. Of this same group 13 percent were receiving gross earnings of less than $50 per week, 28 percent earned between

$50-$64, 24 percent between $65-$79; 19 percent between $80-$99, and 16 percent over $100 per week.

The percentage breakdown by placement categories was as follows:

Currently Employed Weekly Earnings

	Direct	Indirect	Not Placed
Number	19	21	24
Less than $50	16	5	17
$50-$64	31	19	33
$65-$79	26	29	21
$80-$99	16	19	21
$100 or more	10	29	8

The procedure by which the current employed obtained their positions indicates over half went to or were contacted directly by their employers. Other job procurement methods reported were the OWP, public and private employment services, and competitive examination with each accounting for about 14 percent, and the final 8 percent was spread among a variety of other sources.

Over 90 percent of the employed interviewed expressed general satisfaction with their current positions. Only one-fifth expected much of an opportunity for advancement while almost one-half recognized their employment provided no advancement potential and the remaining one-third felt it depended upon a variety of unknowns. Few of the employed attempted to hold down a second job with only one out of twenty indicating he did so.

Cohort of Clients Employed Prior to Their Current Labor Force Status

An analysis of the cohort of clients who had at least one job beyond their current employment status reveals about 75 percent of the group had been employed with four-fifths of the group obtaining their job prior to OWP contact. Nearly two-thirds of this group reported they obtained their job by going directly to the employer. About 14 percent of those remaining had been referred by the OWP and the remaining job referral methods were fairly evenly distributed among a variety of other sources.

The following table shows a percentage breakdown of these client's former weekly earning rates by placement category:

Weekly Earnings of Cohort Employed Prior to Current Labor Force Status

	Total	Direct	Indirect	Not Placed
Number	57	9	15	33
Less than $50	28	22	32	27
$50-$64	30	33	27	30
$65-$79	14	22	7	15
$80-$99	9	11	7	9
$100+	19	11	27	18

A comparison of this cohort's earning experience compared to the group employed when interviewed reveals no clear-cut distinctions. About the same proportion in each group fell in the over 100 and $50-$64 classifications; there was a greater proportion of clients earning less than $49 in the "prior employment" cohort but a much smaller percentage in the $65-$79 and $80-$99 classification. Fifty-nine percent of those employed at the time of interview earned over $65 per week whereas only 42 percent of the other group earned above this level.

About two-fifths of those leaving their former job reported they were laid-off or fired. Another one-fifth changed to another job, 15 precent reported they retired and 10 percent were injured or became ill. The remainder reported a variety of reasons for leaving including transfer of company, failure to get along with supervisor and didn't like the work conditions.

Cohort of Unemployed Prior to Current Labor Force Status

An important cohort of clients was those reporting at least one period of unemployment since 1960 with about three-fifths of the sample fitting this description. Another similar group of about one-fifth of the sample was classified as not in the labor force during this same period.

Tabulations of these two groups on a combined basis indicate four-fifths were able to work and only 12 percent reported refusing any job offers. One-third of the combined group received unemployment compensation during the out of work period. Less than five percent reported receiving welfare payments.

A further analysis of the unemployed group, excluding those out of the labor force, shows about two-fifths of Direct and Indirect clients received unemployment compensation whereas one-fifth of those Not Placed received such payments. Of those receiving unemployment insurance about 10 percent received less than $30 per week, another 30 percent received between $30 and $39 per week and the remaining 60 percent reported receiving over $40 per week in payments. Generally, the Not Placed clients received lower weekly rates than did clients in the other two categories.

The following table outlines the proportions of clients whose family income was within each classification by placement group.

Weekly Family Income-Unemployed Cohort

	Total	Direct	Indirect	Not Placed
Number	83	17	19	47
Less than $50	39	24	37	45
$50-$64	13	18	16	11
$65-$79	7	6	11	6
$80-$99	15	24	11	13
$100+	26	29	26	25

A disproportionate number of Not Placed clients reported incomes below $50 per week. The category of Direct placements had a more uniform distribution of clients within the five income ranges but all three groups had about the same proportion of clients with family incomes of over $100 per week.

Attitude Toward the Project

The referral procedure through which OWP applicants gained access to the Project as reported by the sample interviewed, closely parallels the data reported by the Project even though the two are not entirely comparable. For example: 45 percent reported they first heard about the OWP through various mass media and 46 percent of the Project reported clients were self referrals. In addition, the number referred through the Maryland State Employment Service was one-fifth of the total in both instances. The most marked difference was the two-fifths referred from community agencies as reported by the Project whereas the sample applicants only reported one-fifth originating from this source.

OWP reports indicated an average of 3.5 follow-up interviews were conducted for each applicant with about one-fifth of these interviews conducted at the office and the remainder completed via telephone. The questionnaire was used in the current evaluation provided some partially comparable data as the interviewer couched one question in terms of the number of visits to the OWP office. Sixty percent of the respondents reported more than one visit to the OWP office, half of whom indicated two visits. As previously noted, although each client had at least one face-to-face interview with a job counselor, only 15 percent reported receiving counselling services. Three percent of the respondents said they had been given assistance in preparing resumes but four-fifths of those interviewed said they did not receive any assistance beyond placement services. Much of this failure to acknowledge additional OWP services can probably be attributed to the unfortunate use of the undefined term "placement services."

One question directed to obtaining the respondents over-all attitude toward the OWP revealed a fairly equal distribution of positive and negative comments. The most frequent comment, 25 percent, was the Project gave little assistance and the respondent was forced to get his own job. Most of those responding in this fashion were from the Not Placed category, with the remainder from the Indirect group. Another negative response, accounting for 13 percent of the total, noted a need for better counselling and placement techniques. Fourteen percent criticized the Project for not finding them a job.

On the positive side, 29 percent said they were pleased with the program and the people who operated it. An additional 5 percent expressed their appreciation for the Project finding them a job.

About three-fifths of the respondent's comments about the Project could be construed as urging specific improvements or were rather negative in tone.* Of these negative comments, 64 percent came from the Not Placed clients with 29 and 7 percent emanating from the Indirect and Direct Placement categories respectively. The positive statements on the other hand were fairly equally distributed with 39, 25 and 39 percent originating from Direct, Indirect and Not Placed clients respectively. (Proportions of respondents in the sample were Direct 20 percent, Indirect 26 percent, Not Placed 54 percent).

Another interview question asked for specific suggestions that would have improved Project services. The most frequently mentioned improvement was the need for better placement procedures and more contact with employers. Next most urgent was the need for greater individual attention and better counselling followed closely by the need for training opportunities. Other suggested improvements were the need for more mature counselors and the removal of entrance requirements such as head of family age limits, etc. This last suggestion was probably a reflection of the more stringent applicant qualifications required following the revised OWP hypothesis which initiated the final Project phase.

---

*

Negative

- Need better counseling and placement assistance.
- Training courses needed.
- Better program publicity.
- Got little or no help, had to get job myself.
- Not pleased with program.
- Unable to find me a job.

Positive

- Too old to be helped.
- Helped me get a job.
- Staff was helpful and considerate.
- Pleased with program - it can be helpful.
- Illness, etc., prevented me from taking full advantage of Project.

Over three-fifths of the respondent's had not registered with the Employment Service since their older worker contact. Reasons for non-registration were as follows: one-third of the group had been employed during the period, about one-quarter were retired or ill, and approximately two-fifths expressed a variety of negative attitudes toward the employment service or claimed they just hadn't bothered.

Of the remaining two-fifths who had registered with the Employment Service only one-third were in the active file when interviewed. Among those who had registered 78 percent reported little or no help from the agency while 22 percent reported they had at least obtained job referrals. The most frequent complaint against the Employment Service was the caliber of counselors to which the clients had been assigned.

Three-fourths of the respondents indicated a positive or caveated positive response to the question of whether they would be willing to take a four-month government training course if it were offered. Almost half of those responding negatively indicated they were too old to begin another career. Contrasting rather sharply with this vocal committment to training was the past experience of the group which showed only 10 percent having participated in a training activity since leaving their regular schooling.

One-fifth of the respondents reported health problems had interfered with their ability to work during the last five years. However, only half that group indicated a current impediment to employment. In response to another question about age acting as a barrier to employment, only 7 percent of those reporting indicated illness or disability was a major employment handicap.

Fifty-eight percent of the respondents indicated the OWP did not send them on any job referrals. Seventy-three percent of the Indirect category and two-thirds of the Not Placed category reported no OWP referrals. Of the 42 percent who had at least one job referral, 45 percent received two or more. About half of those receiving job referrals indicated the general inapplicability of the jobs to which they were referred.

E. NOT PLACED EXPERIENCE

Time caught up with the OWP staff thus proscribing the feasibility of conducting follow-up research on the Not Placed clients as they had done on the Direct and Indirect groups. Demographic and other data available to the staff did not delineate essential differences between the three placement categories. The current sample of respondents followed the same pattern with the exception of the Not Placed which had a somewhat larger proportion of older clients (see page 24).

The final OWP report suggested motivational factors as being one of the more plausible explanations for the inability of this group to obtain employment. Although a verification of this premise is not entirely possible through the more recent follow-up activity there is some indication that such was the case.

There was no significant difference in the number of Not Placed who reported health as a handicap to employment. It is interesting, however, that nearly all of a rather small sample who positively responded to a question on age being a handicap to employment, said they were too old or disabled to find employment. The educational levels of all three groups were comparable, as were the post-regular-schooling educational experiences reported. A few more Not Placed clients replied they would be less enthused about accepting government sponsored training positions with the most frequent caveat being age.

In their job-search experience a greater proportion of Not Placed clients reported receiving job referrals from the OWP than did the Indirect group. However, their employment service experience was less meaningful. Not Placed clients reported the smallest proportion of those who had registered with the Employment Service sine OWP contact (Not Placed 36 percent, Direct 38 percent, Indirect 47 percent) but this same group had 39 percent of its registered reporters currently in the active file compared to 35 and 22 percent for the Indirect and Direct groups respectively.

The proportion of clients who had received job referrals from the employment service was considerably lower for the Not Placed clients - 16 percent-versus Direct 28 percent and Indirect 33 percent. In explaining why they were not registered with the Employment Service, only 20 percent reported current employment contrasted to 61 percent of the Direct group and 39 percent of the Indirect group.

As previously indicated 42 percent of the Not Placed category were employed at the time of interview whereas 69 percent of the Direct placements and 70 percent of the Indirect placements were currently working. Of the then unemployed only an additional one-fifth could report some employment since OWP contact, while Direct and Indirect placements reported two-thirds and two-fifths of the Unemployed had some post-OWP employment.

Again, returning to those employed at the time of interview, it was found that 13 percent of the Not Placed were dissatisfied with their employment while only 8 percent of the Direct group similarly reported and none of the Indirect group expressed dissatisfaction. In the client's personal assessment of advancement 57 percent felt they would not have an opportunity to do so while 3 percent felt they could. Comparative responses for these same two criteria were 45 and 30 percent for Direct clients and 29 and 32 for Indirect respondents.

Comparative data on the experience of the three placements groups in earning and family income levels for various respondent cohorts has already been discussed. To briefly reiterate these findings, there is no consistent evidence to indicate that Not Placed clients were much different than the other two categories. Generally, the Indirect placements had the best record with the Direct and Not Placed groups following closely behind.

Despite the dangers of generalization an over-all purview of attitudinal questions on the survey indicates a less positive response from the Not Placed compared to the other two. Several examples may be illustrative:

In response to a question concerning the usefulness of counselling in assisting older workers find employment, 90 percent of the Direct placements said it was helpful while 84 and 82 percent of the Indirect and Not Placed replied in this fashion.

On the question of whether the respondent would recommend one of his friends to the OWP -- 90 percnet of the Direct and 88 percent of the Indirect said yes as contrasted to only 74 percent of the Not Placed.

Another question asked whether the respondent felt his being over 50 was a handicap in his ability to get employment. About half of the Direct and Indirect thought it was but 70 percent of the Not Placed respond affirmatively.

One further ramification of this last question was the response to a subsequent query on why respondents felt their age was a factor -- over half suggested that employers just didn't understand how reliable and useful older workers could be. There was little difference in the proportion of each client group that responded in this fashion.

In the final analysis the best adjusted and most competent group appeared to be the Indirect placements. This group had the largest proportions of currently employed and employed since OWP contact. Their earning records were slightly better and their attitudes toward job satisfaction, advancement, etc., were more positive. Then, too, the Indirect had by definition virtually exhibited more personal agressiveness because of their ability to obtain employment without relying totally on the OWP.

F. OWP COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

Unfortunately, there are not sufficient experience or data available to make a meaningful cost-benefit analysis of the Project. The training element was essentially non-existent and there was such a wide diversity of services received by each OWP client that it would be difficult to generalize what each received. Some clients received rather extensive counselling, assistance in preparing resumes, several job referrals, and final placement. Others did little more than fill out the appropriate application forms and participate in an initial interview with a job counselor.

The Project budget was approximately $130 thousand. Final expenditures were just under $100 thousand. As of the end of December 1965, when active client field work was discontinued, $74 thousand had been spent (this includes salaries as well as fixed costs). The remainder of the Project's experience was devoted primarily to a self-evaluation including a series of client and employer follow-up studies.

Using financial data through December the average Direct cost per Project applicant was about $120. (A similar estimate made by OWP staff, which excluded fixed costs, suggested a $92 per client average). The cost per placed applicant by the Project would be over $850 for Direct placements and about $380 if Indirect placements were also included.

A further analysis of the cost per job placement rather than applicant placement -- 86 applicants were placed in 103 jobs -- by phase shows a first phase cost of $1000 per placement. Similar data for phases two and three indicates a average cost of $490 and $870 respectively. Again, using financial data through December the average cost per placement for the Project was $670.

G. EMPLOYER SURVEY

In the survey of employers requesting information on the OWP applicants hired by their companies, three-fifths of the company representatives reported they were familiar with the Center. Four-fifths said they were willing to hire older workers but only one-third agreed to express an opinion about the Project's services all of which said it was effective or satisfactory.

The employer representatives reported about two-fifths of the Direct Project placements were still employed by their companies. (This compared to a level of one-third of the OWP respondents who said they still worked on the job the Project obtained for them).

The overwhelming majority of employer representatives -- 88 percent, said older workers could perform the type of work they had been hired to do. As the following table indicates, most of the employer representatives felt older workers compared favorably with other employees.

	Percentage of Employer Representatives Responding			
Comparison of Older Workers with Other Employees	Job Performance	Cooperation with Supervisors	Cooperation with Co-Workers	Reliability
Very satisfactory	36	55	53	43
Satisfactory	36	33	35	41
Less than satisfactory	27	12	12	15

Over one-third also reported that employees they hired had been advanced or received pay increases.

Finally, it was found that 70 percent of the companies interviewed did not have a formal training program although about half of them have an on-the-job training program for new workers.

H. CONCLUSION

It is unfortunate that so much time was lost in Project operations based on the originally proposed hypothesis. If an adequate pretest of the proposed activity had been made it is unlikely that the Project would have been initiated. However, the final phase activity of intensive older worker counselling followed by third party intervention in the placement process does appear to have some merit worthy of further evaluation.

Perhaps additional experience with the Project's final phase activities could result in the answers to questions posed in the introduction to the report as well as substantiating the usefulness of the approach but the currently available data are inconclusive. A further justification must also be made for the considerably greater cost required to implement such a program or provisions made for alternate procedures which will reduce program costs.

Assuming proper justification could be made the next question concerns the need for establishing a new institution for implementing such a program. There was no evidence of new procedures developed by OWP staff. Given the proclivity and resources the employment services could have performed all the services provided by the OWP with even greater efficiency because of their experience in the field.

The inexperience of the OWP staff in the specific problems of the older worker and the implementation of job counselling and development activities also contributed to Project ineffectiveness. Certainly staff members are to be commended for their continued development throughout the Project's life but the time required for attaining staff expertise could have more profitably been devoted to developing client services. Had there been better overall project administration by NCOA or OMPER many of the staff problems might have been alleviated either by the provision of more assistance in the staffing process or a postponement of the Project's initiation until the staff was properly oriented.

It now appears that many of the Project's difficulties can be traced to the failure of NCOA and OMPER to provide proper technical assistance to a HWC staff that was unfamilar with operating a project of this type. Over half the year was lost before NCOA provided the technical assistance which resulted in the redirection of the Project's activities; however, even then there appears to have been little special expertise shown by NCOA in describing a program suitably designed to overcome the particular problems of the older worker.

OMPER certainly bears some responsibility for the ineffective administration of the Project. The contractual agreement with HWC failed to specify the HWC-NCOA relationship. Neither was NCOA's contractual responsibility for providing the agreed upon technical assistance to HWC adequately monitored by OMPER. Finally, there is the question of whether OMPER should have ever used the developmental contractor. The extra administrative unit added to the Project operating problems and offered little in providing expected technical expertise. OMPER could have probably performed an equally effective administrative role including more control over the initiation and subsequent redirection of the Project's goals without the assistance of the additional contractor. Had OMPER assumed its proper administrative responsibility for the OWP the difficulties encountered may have been partially obviated.

I. APPENDIX

1. COMPONENT I JOB COUNSELLING AND REFERRAL CLINICS

The Job Counselling and Referral Clinic's concept was originally proposed by Maryland Congressman Clarence D. Long to assist a fairly large group of recently unemployed persons who had been laid off from local manufacturing concerns after long steady post-war employment histories. These people possessed only moderate skills and generally lacked the confidence and experience necessary to begin another job search at that stage in their lives.

The Labor Department requested the Baltimore Health and Welfare Council to implement a program as proposed by Congressman Long. HWC reported another segment of the unemployment population uncovered in a recent antipoverty survey with similar job-search difficulties but rather dissimilar prior work histories. A further analysis suggested that both groups could be assisted by a comprehensive counselling procedure directed to establishing a more positive employment attitude among these people.

The most efficient method in view of the limited resources and the large number of prospective clients was the establishment of group counselling clinics. Large numbers of people could thus obtain the benefits of skilled vocational counselors, inter-action with persons having similar problems, and necessary assistance from social service case workers.

A broad range of referral inputs were utilized to search for people with substantial unemployment or other job-search difficulties. The program was to accept a minimum of 1000 interested job-seekers regardless of qualifications or background. During 1965, nearly 1350 participants matriculated into the program. Most were Negro, heads of household with one or more dependents. Participant characteristics indicated a median age of 38 years, a median education level of 10.1 years and median unemployment period of 7.5 months. Seventy-two percent were either blue-collar or service workers.

The major service provided was a series of six group counseling sessions running for two hours, twice a week, in consecutive weeks. Six geographic locations were located within the Baltimore area and each clinic enrolled between 15 and 25 participants during each cycle.

In the group sessions material was presented to assist the participants in making a more meaningful employment search. Specific subject matter included the application process, employment interviewing, preparation and use of resumes, planning a systematic job search, test taking, current labor market information and vocational programs.

A social case worker assisted participants in resolving their individual social-economic problems and specific referrals were made to local vocational training programs. JCC records indicated approximately 90 clients were referred to the OWP whereas the latter reported only 70 referrals from this source. A follow-up of JCC participants revealed 34 percent were employed and 7 percent were in training with the remaining group indicating they were desirious of obtaining training. Although 36 percent of JCC clients were referred to MDTA courses only 7 percent reported they participated in such a course. Two criteria were cited in this failure to involve more JCC clients in MDTA courses: (1) limited choice of alternative courses available and (2) the inability of client participants to meet minimum entrance requirements.

Although the Job Counselling Clinic was scheduled for phasing out at the end of 1965 it was subsequently refunded for 1966 operations. Local labor market conditions resulted in increasingly more difficult cases appearing in the counselling clinics. Program operations were broadened to include job development and other employment services.

2. STATISTICAL APPENDIX[*]

Percentages

Employment Status at Interview

	Total	Direct	Indirect	Not Placed
	%	%	%	%
Number	144	29	37	78
Employed	54	69	70	42
Unemployed	33	21	19	44
Not in Labor Force	13	10	11	14

Some Employment Since OWP Contact

	%	%	%	%
Number	64	9	11	44
Yes	28	67	36	18
No	72	33	64	82

Gross Weekly Earnings of Currently Employed

	%	%	%	%
Number	64	19	21	24
Less than 49	13	16	5	17
$50-64	28	31	19	33
65-79	24	26	29	21
80-99	19	16	19	21
100+	16	10	29	8

Current Employment Job Satisfaction

	%	%	%	%
Number	75	20	25	30
Satisfied	66	70	64	63
Not Satisfied	7	-	8	13
Depends	27	30	28	23

Currently Employed-Assessment of Job Advancement Potential

	%	%	%	%
Number	72	20	24	28
None	45	45	29	57
Depends	34	25	38	40
Expects advancement	21	30	32	3

---

[*] Throughout this report the number of respondents only includes those who replied directly to the questions. Respondents who did not reply, gave no opinion, or an inapplicable response are excluded from the tabulations. The sampling and interview procedures are described on pp. 28-32.

Experience of Clients with at Least One Employment Position Prior to Present Labor Force Status

Percentages

Method in which job was Obtained

	Total		Direct		Indirect		Not Placed	
		%		%		%		%
Number	59		10		15		34	
Public or Private		8		10		7		9
Directly with employer		64		20		67		76
Older Worker Project		12		70		-		-
Other		15		-		27		15

Weekly Earnings in Previous Job

		%		%		%		%
Number	57		9		15		33	
Less than 49		28		22		32		27
50-64		30		33		27		30
65-79		14		22		7		15
80-99		9		11		7		9
100+		19		11		27		18

Reason for Leaving Previous Employment

		%		%		%		%
Number	61		10		15		36	
Laid-off or fired		41		20		33		50
Changed to another job		20		40		33		8
Illness		10		10		13		8
Retired		15		-		7		22
Other		15		30		13		11

Experience of Cohort with Unemployment Prior to Current Labor Force Status

Percentages

	Total		Direct		Indirect		Not Placed	
Labor Force Status								
		%		%		%		%
Number	112		25		26		61	
Unemployed		73		88		77		66
Not in Labor Force		27		12		23		34
Able to Work								
		%		%		%		%
Number	108		23		28		57	
Yes		78		78		86		74
No		22		22		14		26
Refused Any Specific Job Officers								
		%		%		%		%
Number	102		22		24		56	
Yes		12		14		17		9
No		89		86		83		91
Received Unemployment Insurance								
		%		%		%		%
Number	123		29		29		55	
Yes		33		41		48		23
No		67		59		52		77
Family Income Out-of-Work Period								
		%		%		%		%
Number	83		17		19		47	
Less than 49		39		24		37		45
50-64		13		18		16		11
65-79		7		6		11		6
80-99		15		24		11		13
100+		26		29		26		25

Employment Service Experience of OWP Applicants

Percentages

Registered with Employment Service Since OWP Contact

	Total		Direct		Indirect		Not Placed	
		%		%		%		%
Number	142		29		36		77	
Yes		39		38		47		36
No		61		62		53		64

Registered at Time of Interview

		%		%		%		%
Number	53		9		17		28	
Yes		34		22		35		39
No		66		77		65		61

Reasons for Non-Registration with Employment Service

		%		%		%		%
Number	74		18		16		40	
Employed		34		61		37		20
Illness		7		-		19		5
Retired		18		17		-		25
Varied Negative*		42		22		44		50

* Note worth the bother - discouraged didn't know about it - too busy, etc.

Applicants Recall on First Hearing About Older Worker Project

		%		%		%		%
Number	143		29		37		77	
Mass Media		45		41		43		47
MSES		20		21		19		21
Friends		17		17		22		16
Other Agencies		18		21		17		17

OWP Services Other Than Placement Services

		%		%		%		%
Number	137		27		34		76	
None		80		70		82		83
Counseling only		15		22		15		13
Resume Preparation		3		4		3		3
Other		1		4		-		1

Number of OWP Job Referals Received

	Total		Direct		Indirect		Not Placed	
		%		%		%		%
Number Respondents	128		20		34		74	
None		58		-		73		66
One		23		60		12		19
Two or more		19		40		15		15

Interest in Government Retraining Course

		%		%		%		%
Number	130		27		33		70	
Yes		66		71		60		67
No		25		26		27		23
Depends		9		4		12		10

Additional Education Since Regular Schooling

		%		%		%		%
Number	139		28		36		75	
Yes		10		7		11		11
No		90		94		89		89

Presence of Health Problem which Prevents Working

		%		%		%		%
Number	135		28		33		74	
Yes		22		21		27		20
No		78		79		73		80

Would you recommend that other workers over 50, like yourself, receive counseling?

		%		%		%		%
Number	135		29		32		74	
Yes		85		90		84		82
No		15		10		16		18

Would you recommend to a friend that he attempt to find work through the auspices of the older work project?

		%		%		%		%
Number	133		29		32		72	
Yes		80		90		88		74
No		20		10		12		26

Has the fact that you are over 50 been important in your finding a job?

		&		&		&		&
Number	124		26		30		68	
Yes		61		50		53		70
No		39		50		47		31

THE NCOA OLDER WORKER PROJECT IN BOSTON

by

David P. Taylor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
A.	BACKGROUND OF THE KENNEDY CENTER	57
B.	ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS	62
C.	M.D.T.A. PROGRAM	65
D.	PLACEMENT ACTIVITY	74
E.	EMPLOYER REACTION TO THE OLDER WORKER PROGRAM	110
F.	CONCLUSIONS	118
G.	APPENDIX	121

A. BACKGROUND OF THE KENNEDY CENTER*

Because there is some considerable interest in the administrative agencies sponsoring older worker training and placement projects, it would be useful to discuss briefly the background of the agency responsible for the Boston project. The John F. Kennedy Family Service Center was founded in March, 1965, as a non-profit corporation to:[1]

a. Provide services that are visible and accessible on a neighborhood level

b. Reach out to serve families and individuals who are least able or willing to seek out and use the help of existing services, and

c. Make available a battery of services coordinated around the family as a unit.

From the outset the Center has emphasized its intention to implement a multi-service approach to welfare programs. What this means operationally is that when a client comes in, he is intensively interviewed, and all the problems he faces are discussed. The Center then deals with these problems either through its own staff of psychologists, family counselors, job placement specialists, etc., or refers the client to appropriate clinics or other welfare agencies for service.

One of the first, if not the first, projects undertaken by the Kennedy Center was the Older Worker Training Program (as the Center referred to it in the early stages). This project had originally been contracted to Action for Boston Community Development (ABCD), established to assist the Boston Redevelopment Authority in solving the "human" problems associated with urban renewal. In its early form, the Older Worker Project fitted in well with this objective since it was designed to assist older workers affected by a massive urban renewal project which was to have been implemented in Charlestown, a section of the city of Boston.

---

*The entire staff of the Kennedy Center's Older Worker Project was extremely helpful to me in preparing this report and I am happy to acknowledge their assistance. I am particularly grateful to Louis Dennis and Alvin Simmons.

[1] The Older Worker Training and Employment Program of the John F. Kennedy Family Service Center: A Progress and Case Study Report, April 26, 1965 (mimeo), p. 1.

Because some of the community workers active in Charlestown recognized a need for a multi-service welfare organization in the area, they established the Kennedy Center with the help of a number of civic leaders in both Charlestown and other parts of Boston. The Kennedy Center was an appropriate organization to sponsor an older worker project which was designed to assist the people affected by the urban renewal activity in that community. As it turned out, however, the urban renewal program was delayed and has only recently got underway, while the contract for the initial Older Worker Project expired in June, 1966. Hence the emphasis of the Project was shifted from ameliorating the effects of urban renewal to a general training and placement program for older people.

This discussion is relevant to the question that has been raised as to whether it is better to use ad hoc or continuing organizations to administer these projects. The Kennedy Center represents a middle ground. It was established as an on-going organization, but with the Older Worker Project as a charter program. The Center's performance in administering the project should be interpreted with that fact in mind since it has implications for the staffing problems, the planning function, and other administrative inputs required for running the project.

1. Early Operation of the Program

The Kennedy Center became the official contractor for the Older Worker Project on April 14, 1965, but actual work on the project had begun as soon as the Center was established -- about a month earlier. The emphasis of the project, as the Center saw it, was to be on three major areas of employment activity listed in descending order:[2]

1. To relate the background, skills, and experience of individual applicants to the current labor force needs within the Greater Boston area.

2. Utilization of MDTA training programs and an individualized OJT program approved by the Department of Labor and to be executed by the Kennedy Center's Older Worker Program.

3. To develop contacts with industrial firms, educational and medical institutions, and social agencies to develop new job opportunities for applicants.

In explanation of the order in which the objectives are listed, the Center indicates that it expected a large percentage of its applicants to come from Charlestown (as it turned out about 36% were from Charlestown) and the work force in the area is characterized by heavy concentrations of semi- and unskilled workers. Initial interviews led the Center to believe that, "... members of this population are reluctant to explore new, and to them, strange patterns of employment." Thus the major emphasis of the project was to be on placement, not training.

---

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 2ff

In addition to the reasons mentioned in the periodic reports of the Center for this lack of emphasis on training, the Kennedy Center officials also cite the structure of MDTA programs. When an applicant comes into the Center, in almost all cases he has come in to get work. A training program may provide excellent opportunities for upgrading, but even if the applicant is willing to take the training, a program may not be getting underway for a period of time. Thus the applicant has to remain unemployed or take a temporary job until the program gets started. Because the Kennedy Center staff felt that there was pressure on them to solve the applicant's immediate financial problems, they apparently soon gave up the training aspects of the program and concentrated almost exclusively on placement activity.

Because of this emphasis, the Center established a relationship with State's Division of Employment Security, which led to a D.E.S. referral program. (If the Center's emphasis had been on training, it would not have made much sense for the D.E.S. to refer applicants to the Center for re-referral to the D.E.S. for training). Under the terms of the agreement the D.E.S. was to refer 50 "employable" applicants between the ages of 50 and 65 to the Center. An "employable" applicant is only hampered in his job search efforts by his age and specifically has none of the following problems:[3]

1. Major medical problems
2. Chronic or recent record of alcoholism
3. Pattern of criminal activity

---

[3] The Older Worker Training and Employment Program of the John F. Kennedy Family Service Center: A Progress and Case Study Report, May, 1965, p. 2.

Four of the Boston offices (Service and Domestic, Professional and Technical, Industrial, Sales and Clerical) participated in this joint effort. The D.E.S. - J.F.K. program was to have had a built-in research dimension. The D.E.S. counselors were to select 100 applicants from their files who were classified as "hard-core" unemployed older workers on the following criteria.

1. Applicants who had been registered with the D.E.S. for a minimum of eight to ten weeks and for whom no immediate job opportunities were available.

2. Applicants who had been registered with the D.E.S. for any length of time and for whom, in the D.E.S. counselor's judgment, no foreseeable job opportunities exist.

These applicants were then to be placed in two randomly assigned groups. Half would be returned to the regular files of the D.E.S. counselors and their records flagged. The other half would be classified as a test group and referred to the Kennedy Center if they showed an interest in the Center's specialized services. There was then to be a follow-up analysis of the two groups designed to answer the following questions.[4]

"What differences in employment will develop between the two groups? What factors might be identified as contributing to success between the two groups? What factors are apparent deterrents to successful employment for members of each group? If certain success factors can be identified with some reliability and validity, what considerations might this joint endeavor raise for the Massachusetts D.E.S. and the Employment Security Divisions at large?"

---

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

Despite the fact that 103 applicants were sent to the Kennedy Center from D.E.S. offices (although not all of these were in the "test" group), no follow-up was ever completed of the control group remaining under the auspices of the D.E.S. This failure apparently stems from frequent changes in personnel at the D.E.S. In the last two years there have been three supervisors of the placement office involved and two district supervisors to whom the office supervisor reports. In all this shuffling the record-keeping necessary to complete the follow-up program was never done.

B. ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS

One of the most discouraging experiences the Kennedy Center encountered in the course of this project was the on-the-job training program they developed in conjunction with the D.E.S. The contract provided that:[5]

1. A company of any size could establish an on-the-job training program.

2. A company under contract must not have a training program already in existence for the job opportunity in question.

3. The training must be conducted five days a week over a full work day and must consist of a minimum of thirty hours per week.

4. These funds are not to be used for the promotion of a low wage incentive for the employer but rather as an inducement for a higher starting rate where possible; and to encourage employers to give worthwhile work opportunities to older workers.

5. An employer could be reimbursed up to $25 per week to cover his supervisory expenses in the training period.

---

[5] Older Workers Training and Employment Program, JFK Center, April, 1967 (mimeo) p. 34ff.

The Center hired an on-the-job training specialist two months after the contract had been negotiated. His duties basically involved selling OJT programs to Boston area employers. As a by-product he undoubtedly developed a number of openings unrelated to training programs. This specialist contacted 97 firms of which three indicated a willingness to set up an OJT program. In these three cases, each of the jobs[6] required previous mechanical training or aptitutde, involved long periods of standing, and had a starting rate of $1.50 per hour. None of these slots was ever filled by the Kennedy Center.

Concurrently, personnel from the Center were reviewing records of applicants at local offices of the D.E.S. to identify eligible older workers to install in OJT programs. Five hundred records were selected and cards were sent to the candidates asking them to appear for an interview. Of these 500 candidates, 87 appeared for interviews with the Center's representatives. Fifty-one of these were judged to be qualified for OJT should appropriate programs be developed.

Two applicants, both males, were utlimately placed in an OJT program which was apparently not one of those developed by the OJT specialist. We interviewed both these men, and some questions might even be raised about this program. One of the men had had extensive experience as a machinist and he did not feel that the training contributed much, if anything, to his skill level. It was true that he was on a turret lathe, but this represented no great accomplishment in view of his wide experience in machine shops.

---

[6] The three jobs were: (1) gold stamping and engraving machine operator in a stationery company, (2) clicking machine operator in a shoe manufacturing firm, and (3) set-up man to service a number of machines in an electrical manufacturing firm.

The other worker quit the firm after three months because he had been placed on a job other than that for which he was trained and at a lower wage. He was currently working as a watchman, but at the same time he was looking for work as a machinist.

There are undoubtedly a number of interrelated reasons for the failure of this program to produce much in the way of tangible results despite the substantial investment made in it. The Kennedy Center has identified the following:[7]

1. No attempt was made to generate applicants who were suitable for specific openings or vice versa. "By the time a suitable applicant was identified, the opening was often filled."

2. The training opportunities were usually available only at small firms (50-150 employees) and there was limited opportunity for advancement.

3. The starting rates were low; generally around $1.60 per hour.

4. Because of their background and experience, most applicants were best served by direct placement.

5. The applicants tended to identify with one or two occupational areas and were unwilling to take training in other areas.

6. Employers were uninterested in training older workers even while they had on-going training programs for young people. "Many

---

[7] _Ibid._, pp. 39-42.

employers were interested in hiring older workers but usually for relatively simple tasks that could be readily learned."

It seems to me that three points can be raised about this explanation. First it is clear that the OJT program was never large enough to achieve the economies of scale which characterized the Center's regular placement program. One of the costs of a small, carefully tailored operation is that opportunities for a placement will be lost in the time it takes to generate an appropriate applicant for a pending vacancy or an opening for a waiting applicant. This need not be an inherent difficulty with OJT programs for older workers, but it was apparently a problem with this one.

Second, the low wage rates attached to these training openings may well have been a reflection of Gary Becker's analysis indicating that the employee in part subsidizes his own training. Older workers naturally have less incentive to invest in training in this way since their pay back period is short. As a result these workers will prefer a job with a higher starting salary and little chance for advancement to one with a low starting salary and substantial advancement possibilities.

Third, for the same reasons employers are unwilling to train older workers since this training -- and the paper work in this case -- have costs attached. These costs will not be made up in the employee's career with the firm, and the $25 per week payments were evidently not sufficient to provide an offset. These latter two arguments probably apply to any scheme to train older workers on the job in private enterprises.

C. MDTA PROGRAM

If on-the-job training is not the answer for supplying older workers with additional skills, the next logical possibility is MDTA training programs under which the employer has no financial obligation and gets the worker after he has been through training. Of course, some of the problems with OJT mentioned above apply here as well: There are situations when it is imperative to find the applicant a job immediately, some workers have rigid ideas about their occupational area, etc. But for an unemployed applicant without relevant industrial skills, an opportunity to learn these skills while receiving a weekly payment in excess of $40 would not appear to be unattractive.

We interviewed all the people we could find who had gone through an MDTA program as a result of their contact with the Kennedy Center. In total we were able to interview only eleven people, and one of these was in the OJT program discussed above. With the sample of ten (or nine, as we shall see below) it is probably better to discuss each case individually and try to draw general conclusions rather than present a number of tables with one or two observations in each cell.

1. A 47-year old white male was interviewed in the Veteran's hospital where he had been for a few weeks for treatment of frost bitten feet. He had frozen his feet sleeping on the banks of the Charles River in subzero temperatures. His occupation prior to entering the hospital had been as a handyman at a liquor store where his pay was apparently both in cash and merchandise. He was distressed that at the VA hospital they were trying to treat his alcoholism as well as his frostbite.

The Kennedy Center had come to his attention because it was in the neighborhood of the liquor store and he had been referred to an MDTA program in automotive repair by the Center. He attended only a few classes before quitting the program for a number of reasons. First, the classes were held at night and he didn't care for that. Second, it was a long commute from Charlestown, where the liquor store was located, to the classes in Waltham. Third, the work was nasty and dirty, and fourth, the cars they had to repair were old wrecks, not new cars as he had expected when he signed up for the program. He had no intention of trying to find auto repair work or going back into training when he was released from the hospital. He was heading straight back to the liquor store.

2. A 52-year old white female was interviewed at her dilapidated home in Charlestown. She had been through two MDTA courses about a year apart. Her husband's death in 1963 necessitated her entry into the labor force. Because of her interest in the subject matter, she was originally referred to an MDTA course in garment alteration. She completed the course but was unable to find steady work. She returned to the Center and was referred to another course, this time in waitress training. She completed that course and again was unable to find steady work. Throughout this entire period her physical condition has been deteriorating. She has suffered from severe obesity and now complains of an unspecified heart condition. She has made no recent attempts to find work, and it appeared to me that she was just barely able to get around her house. Further, she apparently has yet to get over her husband's death and the macabre circumstances surrounding it.

3. A 57-year old white female also re-entered the labor force, as a result of her husband's death, after many years as a housewife. She has an unmarried twenty-two year old son living at home who contributes

to the family's support. She went to the Center for assistance in finding employment. She was referred to the garment alteration course and upon completion the D.E.S. found her a job at a hotel in the mending department. After working there for six to seven weeks she had a bursitis attack and quit. She was not sorry to leave the job since it was beneath her training. She is currently not interested in finding a job unless something such as a very good one comes along.

4. A Negro male, age 51, had worked for over ten years as a janitor after his arrival in Boston. When he lost his job, he applied to the Kennedy Center and was referred to the custodian-handyman training program. He completed the program and the D.E.S. found him a job at a commercial establishment as a janitor.

He felt the main advantage of the training was that it widened his area of contacts. He was unimpressed by, but not critical of, the program. He is apparently satisfied with his job and was very pleased by the treatment he got at the Center.

5. A 55-year old white female had supported herself for about eight years since her husband's death by running a small variety store. The store was looted and burned and after a year or so to get over the shock she went to the Kennedy Center. She was referred to a course in calculating machine operation and is working in an insurance firm using some of the skills she picked up in the course.

She could not praise the Kennedy Center enough, and she was most enthusiastic about the training program she had gone through. She is still employed and very happy at her job.

6. A 49-year old white female entered the labor force on her husband's death a few years ago and went to the Kennedy Center where she was referred to a clerk-typist course. About two weeks prior to the completion of the

course she fractured her arm in a fall. She was allowed to complete the course and graduate with her class. She had not looked for work since the completion of the course, a few months prior to the interview, but had an appointment the following day at New England Telephone for a clerk-typist's job. Her daughter, a summer employee of the Telephone Company, had arranged the interview.

7. A white female, aged 61, had not worked since her marriage almost forty years earlier. After her husband's death, a number of years ago, she still did not enter the labor force, but a year or so ago she decided it would be good for her to get out of the house. She had read about the Kennedy Center's older worker project and decided to give it a try. She was referred to the clerk-typist training program and enjoyed it very much, apparently doing quite well.

Unfortunately, however, she was in an auto accident (as a passenger in a taxi) just as the training ended, and she injured her arm and sustained a concussion. Although the after effects of these injuries have disappeared, she still has not actively looked for work. She says if something really good came along in the way of a job she would take it.

8. A 56-year old white female had been separated from her husband for about a year. As a result she was forced back into the labor force after a long period as a housewife. Prior to her marriage she had been a secretary and had gone to a secretarial school after graduating from high school.

She heard about the Center's older worker project and applied for a job. She was referred to a clerk-typist training program which she naturally completed with no difficulty. She applied for a Civil Service rating which she received after a wait of a few months and ever since has been employed at an Air Force Recruiting Station. She reported that the training was not at an Air Force Recruiting Station. She reported that the training was not very useful to her although it was helpful to have a brush-up on her skills. The most important benefit to her was that the Kennedy Center had boosted her morale and had helped ease her way back into the labor force. She had been very impressed with treatment she received from Mary D. Francis, one of the vocational counsellors and urged that we mention this in any report.

9. A white female, aged 57, had gone to work at a Catholic shrine when her husband died and had been employed there for three years as a switchboard operator, her occupation for ten years prior to her marriage. Although she liked the job, she needed higher wages so she went to the Kennedy Center. From there she was referred to an MDTA clerk-typist course which she completed. She then took a temporary job while waiting to get on Civil Service lists at the Boston Navy Yard. Within three months she began work as a clerk at the Navy Yard, but six months later she became sick and had to quit that job. On her recovery she obtained a job through a friend at a large insurance company as a switchboard operator. She is pleased with her job and is happy to be back at what she considers her regular occupation.

10. One final interview was conducted with a white female, age 58, who had not gone through an MDTA training program despite the fact that the Kennedy Center had listed her as attending a clerk-typist course. (In a report issued by the Center after our interviews had been conducted, she was listed as "dropped out prior to training.") What apparently happened in her case was that she failed the aptitude tests given by the D.E.S. She was extremely irritated about this and went so far as to bring out a cribbage board to demonstrate the type of idiotic test she had to take (Purdue Pegboard?)

This woman was the only person we talked to who had virulent negative feelings toward the Kennedy Center, and since there was absolutely no corroboration of her charges it would be inappropriate to discuss them. At the time of the interview she was not actively looking for work, but again, if a good job came along, she would take it, she said.

It is only possible to draw tentative conclusions from limited data of this kind, but some of the following points are raised by these interviews.

1. There appeared to be some tendency to refer persons to programs in occupational areas in which they had previously worked (see Table I). While superficially this would appear to be a waste of government training resources, the more relevant consideration may be that despite the earlier experience in the occupation, the individual was unable (or hesitant to try) to find work in that occupation. Thus the training may have been that essential factor at the margin that spelled the difference between employment on the one hand and unemployment or withdrawal from the labor force on the other.

This tendency further reflects what the Center identified as the preference of the older workers for a narrowly defined "normal" occupational area. This is illustrated by the case of the woman who had worked for a number of years as a switchboard operator at low wages, went to the Center to get a better job at higher pay and was referred to a clerk-typist course. After a few short jobs as a clerk, the last curtailed by sickness, she returned to switchboard operation--her usual occupation.

2. From the comments we received from the interviewees, it was apparent that the women who were forced to re-enter the labor force after years as housewives found the training program extremely beneficial. A number of

Table I

Employed Persons with MDTA Training

No.	Type of Training	Present Occupa.	Pretraining Occupa.	Age	Sex
4	Custodian-Handyman	Janitor	Janitor	51	male
5	Calculating machine operator	Clerk	Storekeeper	55	f
8	Clerk-typist	Clerk-typist	Secretary (many yrs. earlier)	56	f
9	Clerk-typist	Switchboard operator	Switchboard operator	57	f
Soon to be employed					
6	Clerk-typist	interviewed by New England Tel. and Tel.	Housewife	49	f

these women reported that they had some anxiety about trying to find work when they knew their skills were rusty or obsolete. They would be competing for jobs with young girls just out of secretarial schools, and they felt they were at a serious disadvantage whether or not this was actually the case. (Few, if any, of these women had tested the job market prior to going to the Kennedy Center.) Thus, one of the important effects of the training program was to boost the morale and self confidence of the trainees, and this certainly led to increasing their employability.

There were a few cases where the training effort was clearly wasted on people who were unemployable. The alcoholic sent to the auto repair course and the obese woman with coronary problems are two examples. In cases like these, the unemployability of the person is the result of a number of factors, perhaps the least of which is lack of skills. But there is evidence that the Center made an attempt to deal with these other problems. The woman was referred to a clinic to alleviate her obesity and the man went briefly to Alcoholics Anonymous sessions on the advice of Kennedy Center staff. In view of this it is difficult to fault the Center for the way it handled these cases.

1. Administration of MDTA Programs

Operationally, the MDTA referral system worked as follows. When a client came in through the routine intake process, his work history, interests, and potential were reviewed by a placement counsellor. If it appeared that a training course would enhance his employability and the client displayed an interest in going into a training program, the counsellor would call the MDTA office of the D.E.S. to find out if there were any openings in the particular course which had been selected. (The Center counsellors received weekly bulletins on MDTA courses.) If there were openings the client was sent over to the appropriate D.E.S. office--the clerical office, the industrial office, etc.--with an introductory letter from the counsellor. From there the process was the same as for all MDTA applicants. The client was assigned to a D.E.S. counsellor, tested, and if these steps were successfully completed, admitted to the program. Upon completing the training course, the D.E.S. usually took responsibility for placing the graduate. Of course, if nothing was turned up by the D.E.S. the client could return to the Kennedy Center for assistance.

If the Center's involvement in training had been on a larger scale, it probably would have been sensible to set up more elaborate liason with the D.E.S. including procedures for progress reports, special training courses exclusively for Center referrals, and so on. But as indicated in earlier sections, there was no substantial interest in training on the part of most of the applicants and few attempts on the part of the staff to develop any interest. Given these circumstances, administrative ties would have wasted resources.

D. PLACEMENT ACTIVITY

With only a few exceptions the placement activity at the Center followed routine patterns. A job development specialist was charged with the responsibility of generating job orders. He contacted over 300 local firms either in person or by mail and explained the Center's Older Worker Project and solicited openings. The lists of openings were then submitted to the placement counsellors and the usual matching of applicant and opening proceeded.

A variety of recruitment sources were used to generate a flow of applicants to the Center. All of the social, veteran, fraternal, labor and business associations in Charlestown were notified and the local churches made announcements about the program. The local and city-wide press gave the Center's opening considerable coverage. Placards describing the Older Worker Project were displayed in locations throughout Charlestown; in church lobbies, stores, banks, meeting halls, the public housing project, etc.

These procedures naturally led to a substantial amount of word-of-mouth communication about the Center's activities. (One of the women we interviewed who lived a considerable distance from Charlestown had heard of the Center on a radio "talk" program. Someone had called in and lamented about being unable to find work because employers will not hire older people. Someone else called in and briefly described the Kennedy Center's Older Worker Project and suggested the first caller try to find work through that agency.)

As indicated above, the Division of Employment Security also referred people to the Kennedy Center for specialized placement assistance. Apparently the D.E.S. took credit for placements made by the Center when the initial referral was made by the D.E.S.

In this regard, an interesting point was raised during our interview with a district supervisor who was in charge of some of the local D.E.S. office referring people to the Center. She said that their counsellors will make a genuine effort to assist an older worker find a job only when it is clear that he really is interested in working. If it appears that the major, or only, reason an older person has come to the employment service office is to establish his eligibility for unemployment compensation then the counsellors do not harrass him by sending him out on countless job leads. (Although, we are told, the applicant is never informed of this policy.)

If, on the other hand, the older worker demonstrates a genuine interest in finding a job by returning to the employment service after he has already satisfactorily established his "availability for work," or comes into the office when he is not receiving benefits, then the counsellor will make a greater effort to achieve a placement. Among the things the counsellor will do at this point is refer the individual to the Kennedy Center.

According to this analysis (although it should be noted that the D.E.S. supervisor never made this explicit) there is a pre-selection bias affecting the characteristics of individuals from D.E.S. with whom the Kennedy Center deals. That is, the people D.E.S. refers to the Center, unlike an unspecified proportion of the general D.E.S. older worker traffic, are seriously motivated to find work. Hence it would be reasonable to expect the Center's placement record to be better than that of the state employment service.

The sources of the Kennedy Center's total intake are reported below.[8]

Table II

Source of Knowledge of the Kennedy Center

Source	Number	Per Cent
Personal Contact	181	41.6
Advertisement	67	15.4
D.E.S.	104	23.9
Veteran's Org.	6	1.4
Service Org.	1	.2
Other Govt. Agency	2	.5
Community/Private Agency	51	11.7
Private Employment Agency	1	.2
No information	22	5.1
Total	435	100.0

---

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 139

1. Talents Group

From the outset the Kennedy Center noticed a fairly heavy flow of applicants with professional and managerial backgrounds. Of its total intake sixty-six applicants had a primary DOT code in these occupational areas. It soon became apparent that the difficulties these older workers faced in finding employment were different from those faced by semi - or unskilled applicants. They had higher aspiration levels; they had more often been with one employer for an extended period; in some cases their skills were highly specialized to a single firm's operation.

On the other hand, these workers were typically thoughtful and articulate and the Kennedy Center staff decided to mobilize the talents of the workers themselves to help each other find jobs. The Talents Group, which was formally established in July, 1965, was designed to serve this purpose. It was modeled on an earlier organization, 40 Plus, an independent Boston Club with similar objectives, which had recently closed down.

The specific techniques the Talentused in assisting its members in finding work and bolstering their morale were as follows:[9]

1. Thumbnail Sketch. A brief description of each member's qualifications and work history was developed and mimeographed. As the club members went out looking for work they distributed these materials to the various employers they visited.

2. Resumes. Each member wrote up a detailed resume which was then discussed by the club in an effort to improve the form.

3. Mailing Service. The club members were asked to clip want-ads from newspapers which described jobs for which they thought they were qualified. These ads were sent in to the Kennedy Center and a staff member

---

9. Ibid., p. 49 ff

would mail out the resume of the Talents member to the employer with a cover letter describing the older worker project.

These services, which the staff thought to be unusually effective, were later extended to any applicant in an appropriate job category. According to Kennedy Center records, 31 Talents members took advantage of this mailing service between November, 1965 and June, 1966. A total of 1,421 clippings were received from these applicants and sent on to employers for an average of about 46 per person. The range was from one to 336. There were 86 interviews as a result of these mailings and 25 job offers. Eight of these offers were accepted and resulted in employment. The following table presents these data.

Table III

Disposition of Applicants Using Talents Want-ad Mailing Service

Total Using Service	31	
Found jobs through service		8
Found jobs independently		16
Working part-time		4
Unemployed		3

Probably one of the most useful aspects of the Talents group were the weekly meetings in which the applicants discussed their job search activities, their resumes, etc. These meetings undoubtedly brought home to the members the fact that each one's individual problems were not unique and the result must have been to raise the morale and motivation of the group. The joint efforts at job-hunting really amounted to an attempt to organize the most common methods of finding work, gate applications and information from friends. The members, in effect, pooled their job leads in order to utilize them more effectively. Kennedy Center data indicate that twenty-eight of the fifty-seven applicants who attended at least one Talents meeting were self-placed due to the "encouragement of, and suggestions from, these meetings..."[10]

2. Placements

The material presented above has strengthened the point made earlier that the major emphasis on the Center's Older Worker Program was on placements. In order to assess the placement activities of the Center we undertook an interviewing program designed to uncover relationships between personal and work history characteristics on the one hand and placement success on the other with the Kennedy Center as an intervening variable. We thought it was important in this regard to interview a group of people who had not been placed by the Center but whose characteristics were similar to the Center placed clients. The characteristics we were interested in were not only age, experience, skill level, etc. but such dimensions as motivation. Thus it would have been unreasonable to compare those the Center placed with those unemployed. Rather we decided to compare Center placements with self-placements. A person who is self-placed is one who applied to the Kennedy Center for assistance but found a job largely through his own efforts.

In one section of its final report the Center includes the self-placed, or indirect placements in with JFK placed but in another it segregates these individuals. Both tables are reproduced below and the difference in the totals results from the time lapse from March 31 to June 30, 1966.

---

[10] Ibid., p. 51

Table IV[11]

Frequencies and Percentages of Male and Female Applicants Classified According to Placement Category (as of June 30, 1966)

Placement Category	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
JFK Center Placements	225	66.7	91	64.2	316	66.1
Placed by Other Agency	3	.8	3	2.1	6	1.3
Declined JFK Placement	4	1.1	1	.7	5	1.0
Active File	22	6.7	10	7.0	32	6.6
Inactive	83	24.7	37	26.0	120	25.0
TOTAL	337	100.0	142	100.0	479	100.0

---

[11] Ibid., p. 59.

Table V[12]

Frequencies and Percentages of Male and Female Applicants Classified According to Placement Category (as of March 31, 1966)

Placement Category	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Direct Placements	107	35.1	50	38.5	157	36.1
Placed by Other Agency	3	1.0	2	1.5	5	1.1
Declined JFK Placements	4	1.3	1	.8	5	1.1
Active File	48	15.7	11	8.5	59	13.6
Inactive	71	23.3	34	26.1	105	24.2
Indirect Placement	71	23.6	32	24.6	104	23.9
TOTAL	305	100.0	130	100.0	435	100.0

Our target population comes from the data used to develop the second of these tables (Table V). We secured from the Kennedy Center two sets of cards for each of the persons included in the two categories "Direct Placement" and "Indirect Placement." One set gave the individual's name, address and code number and the other set was of punch cards containing some personal and work history characteristics which were collected from the applicant's file at the Center.

We then wrote a letter to each of these individuals and followed up the letter with a telephone interview. We were able to reach 50% of the self placed and 43.3% of the Kennedy Center placed workers for a total sample of 120 (52 and 68 in the two groups respectively). We were unable to reach the remainder for a variety of reasons. Some of the non-respondents were deceased, some had moved and left no forwarding address, some had apparently never been at the address we were given and some simply refused the interview.

---

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 150

We supplemented the data we collected in the interviews with the personal history data supplied by the Kennedy Center. The analysis below is based on both sets of data.

Table VI

Employment Status at Time of Interview

Employment Status	JFK-Placed		Self-Placed	
	N	%	N	%
At Work Full-time	40	58.9	38	73.1
At Work Part-time	7	10.3	6	11.5
Not at Work	21	30.9	8	15.4
TOTAL	68	100.1	52	100.0

Table VII

Labor Force Status and Job Search Activity of Respondents Not At Work

Status	JFK-Placed		Self-Placed	
	N	%	N	%
Looking for Work	8	38.1	0	
Have gone to JFK	2	9.5	0	
Have not gone to JFK	6	28.6	0	
Not looking for Work	13	61.8	8	100.0
Retired	2	9.5	2	25.0
Sickness or Disability	7	33.3	3	37.5
Other Reasons	4	19.0	3	37.5
Totals	21	99.9	8	100.0

We obtained data on the length of time twenty-five of those who had left their JFK jobs had worked on them. The median was five months with a mode of six months. The range was from less than a week to eighteen months. Everyone still employed on a JFK job had been on it for more than nine months and the bulk of them had been employed a year or more.

Tables VI and VII indicate the labor force and employment status at the time of our interview. There is one difficulty with these data. Four of the 68 JFK placed respondents claimed that the Center had never placed them on a job. We kept these people in the JFK sample even though it does complicate some of the analyses.

Twenty-seven or 39.7% of the JFK placed were still on the JFK jobs. Those who left their JFK job did so for the following reasons.

Table VIII

Reason for Leaving JFK Job

Reason for Leaving	No.	%
Laid off - Reduction in Force	2	4.9
Sickness	8	19.6
Quit for Better Job	2	4.9
Quit for Family Reasons	2	4.9
Quit - too far to Commute	5	12.2
Quit - Didn't like Work	12	29.3
Discharged	2	4.9
Never had JFK Job	4	9.7
No Data	4	9.7
Total	41	100.1

The Center staff emphasized the importance of "compressing the intake process" in our interviews, and one test of their ability to do this was the speed with which a placement occurred after application to the Center. Table IX presents data relevant to this point (JFK Data).

Table IX

Length of Time Between Application at Center and Placement

Length of Time	N	%
Within a Day	12	17.7
2-7 Days	19	27.9
8-15 Days	9	13.2
16-30 Days	5	7.3
1-3 Months	10	14.8
More than 3 months	8	11.8
No Data	5	7.4
		100.1

Based on these data it is fair to conclude that the Kennedy Center clients that were placed got rapid service--almost 60 percent were on jobs within two weeks and 45 percent were placed within a week.

There was very little difference between the JFK placed and the self-placed in terms of personal characteristics. The sex breakdown was 61.8 percent male for the JFK placed and 67.4 percent for the self-placed. The educational levels were about the same with both medians at 12 years of school completed. There was a larger percentage of self placed with some college (29.0 percent vs. 17.6 percent). It is tempting to point to this as an important explanatory variable but it would be unjustified statistically because of the sample sizes.

Table X shows the age distribution of the two groups.

Table X

Age Distribution

Age Category	JFK-Placed	Self-Placed
45-49	20.6	13.5
50-54	23.6	15.4
55-59	33.9	30.8
60-64	19.1	34.6
65	2.9	1.9
No Data.		

Again there seems to be no radical difference in the distribution between the two groups. There was however, a greater concentration of workers over 60 in the self-placed category and if we break the sample at that point the difference is significant at the .05 level.

The Kennedy Center did not collect data on the racial characteristics of its applicants. The preponderant majority of their applicants were white and this reflects the Center's location. Charlestown's population was .59% non-white in 1960. And compared with many large cities Boston has a relatively small Negro population -- 9.8% for the City and 3.4% for the SMSA in 1960. We did not feel that it was appropriate in our telephone interviews to inquire about the respondents race. But our interviewers had the very distinct impression that almost all the respondents were white.

We asked the respondents what they considered their regular occupation and what industry this regular occupation was in. In virtually all cases this was interpreted to mean the occupation in which the person had worked longest and if there were any questions -- say from a woman who had been a housewife for years -- the interviewers were instructed to consider their longest job as their regular job.

Table XI shows that 39.7 per cent of the JFK placed and 67.3 per cent of the self placed had regular occupations in the white collar area, and this difference is significant at the .05 level. There are two possible explanations for this. First, the Center's Talents group was almost entirely restricted to white collar workers. The structure of the Talents group, as described above, was more likely to lead to indirect placements than direct placements. That is, the preparation of resumes, joint discussions of job openings and the general cooperative effort was designed to encourage the workers to find jobs on their own, through friends or newspaper ads. (See Table XIII).

Second, one of the employment counselors, Angus Walker, had broad experience in the machining industry. He was reputed to be able to talk to employers with considerable expertise about their job requirements. Consequently, the Center may have had a comparative advantage in the placement of skilled craftsmen.

Other explanations, of course, are also possible but unfortunately they can go in a variety of directions. For example, one could argue that white collar workers have less difficulty than blue collar workers in finding employment. Thus, they come to the Kennedy Center and fill out an application but before the Center can take any action they have found work on their own. Conversely, it may be that white collar workers have a more difficult time finding work. Thus the Center tries to do something for them, is unsuccessful, and finally they find employment on their own. It is my view, based on comments made by the respondents to the interviewers, that both factors were present to some extent. Thus some of the self-placed felt that the Kennedy Center was unable to do anything for them. Others dropped in at the Center at the urging of a friend but were confident that they could find a job on their own.

Table IX

"Regular" Occupation of Respondents

Occupational Group	JFK-Placed		Self-Placed	
	No.	%	No.	%
Professional, Technical & Kindred	3	4.4	8	15.4
Managers, Officials & Proprietors	4	5.9	8	15.4
Clerical and Kindred	18	26.5	13	25.0
Sales Workers	2	2.9	6	11.5
Total White Collar	27	39.7	35	67.3
Craftsmen and Foremen	14	20.6	3	5.8
Operatives and Kindred	12	17.7	8	15.4
Private Household Workers	2	2.9	1	1.9
Service Workers except Private Household	7	10.3	5	9.6
Non-Farm Laborers	4	5.9	0	---
Total Blue Collar	39	57.4	17	32.7
No data	2	2.9	0	---
Total	68	100.0	52	100.0

Table XII

Industry of "Regular" Occupation

Industry Group	JFK-Placed		Self-Placed	
	No.	%	No.	%
Mining	0	--	1	1.9
Construction	2	2.9	1	1.9
Food and Kindred Products	3	4.4	4	7.7
Apparel	3	4.4	0	--
Printing & Publishing	1	1.5	1	1.9
Chemicals	1	1.5	4	7.7
Petroleum Refining	0		1	1.9
Rubber & Misc. Plastic Products	0		4	7.7
Leather Products	1	1.5	0	
Primary Metal Products	0		1	1.9
Electrical and Non-electrical machinery	9	13.3	9	17.3
Transportation Equipment	6	8.8	4	7.7
Instruments	1	1.5	0	
Transportation & Communication	11	16.2	4	7.7
Wholesale Trade	0		1	1.9
Retail Trade	8	11.8	7	13.5
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	4	5.8	0	
Services	4	5.8	4	7.7
Federal Government	4	5.8	2	3.8
Local Government	1	1.5	0	
No data	9	13.3	4	7.7
Total	68	100.0	52	100.0

Table XIII

Source of Present Job for Those Respondents Employed at Time of Interview

Source of Job	JFK-Placed		Self-Placed	
	No.	%	No.	%
Friend or Relative	2	2.9	10	19.2
Newspaper ad	8	11.8	21	40.4
Public Employment Agency	2	2.9	1	1.9
Private Employment Agency	2	2.9	2	3.8
Charitable organization or Church	1	1.5		
Return to Former Employer	2	2.9	8	15.4
Referred by Vocational School	1	1.5		
Gate application	1	1.5	2	3.8
JFK Center	27	39.8		
Unemployed	21	30.9	8	15.4
No data	1	1.5		
Total	68	100.0	52	100.0

Table XII, which indicates the industry of the regular occupation, does not reveal any substantial differences between the two groups.

Table XIV carries through the analysis of Table XI to show the occupation of those respondents who were employed at the time of the interview. The same pattern emerges -- the self-placed are more heavily concentrated in white collar occupations than the JFK placed. This also holds true for those workers who had been placed on jobs by the Center but now are either unemployed or working at other jobs. Less than fifteen per cent of these were placed on white collar jobs by the Center.

Sixteen JFK placed people left their JFK jobs and subsequently found other employment. For thirteen of these people we have data on their present salary per week and their salary on the JFK job. But for four of the thirteen they went from a full to a part-time job or vice versa. That leaves nine respondents on whom we have complete data on these two jobs. The mean starting wage on the JFK jobs was $71 per week and the current salary on the present job was $92 per week. Seven of the nine increased their weekly earnings and two had the same salary on both jobs.

Although the numbers are small, this analysis can be extended to consider the salary situation of those on whom, in addition, we have data on wages just prior to the JFK job. Seven respondents reported a mean salary of $102 per week on the job prior to JFK. The mean of the JFK job was down to $75 per week and on the present job up again to $99 per week for this group.

For these people, at least, it appears that the JFK placement was a stop-gap. After an average of less than five months on the JFK job they found another job that corresponded in salary much more closely to the

Table XIV

Occupation of Employed Respondents at Time of Interview

Occupational Group	JFK-Placed		Self-Placed	
	No.	%	No.	%
Professional, Technical and Kindred	4	8.6	7	15.9
Managers, Officials and Proprietors	0		7	15.9
Clerical and Kindred	17	36.2	14	31.8
Sales Workers	0	___	2	4.6
Total White Collar	21	44.8	30	68.2
Craftsmen and Foremen	5	10.6	1	2.3
Operatives and Kindred	5	10.6	4	9.1
Private Household Workers	3	6.4	1	2.3
Service Workers except Private Household	9	19.2	8	18.2
Non Farm Laborers	2	4.3	0	___
Total Blue Collar	24	51.1	14	31.9
Total Unemployed	21		8	
No Data	2	4.3	0	
Total	68	100.2	52	100.1

jobs they had held prior to their contact with the Center. Of these nine workers, seven left the JFK job because they did not like the work or conditions or for a better job, and two left because the commuting distance was too long.

As it turned out we had a great deal of trouble collecting wage and salary data from the self-placed. They were in general less cooperative as a group than the JFK-placed. In many cases their contact with the Center had been only casual -- they dropped in one day -- and they thus felt that our interviews were an unwarranted invasion of privacy (which from their standpoint they were). As one might expect, this concern with privacy was manifested most frequently in regard to financial matters. The result is that we have current salary data on less than half the self-placed respondents, but slightly more information on their pre-Kennedy Center experience.

Tables XV and XVa present pre-JFK wage data for the JFK-placed and the self-placed. The fact that the self-placed were concentrated more in white collar jobs is reflected in the relative wage levels of the two groups with the mean for the self-placed at $23 a week above the mean for JFK-placed. The relative distribution of wages is also interesting. Both groups have from 40 to 45 percent in the below $90 a week category and the JFK-placed are distributed fairly uniformly up to the higher end of the wage scale. The self-placed, conversely, are distributed more in a bi-modal fashion with almost a third earning over $160 a week while none of the JFK-placed were in this category. The shape of the distribution of self-placed supports the impression mentioned earlier that this group was composed of people who had either a relatively easy time finding work or a very difficult job hunt.

Table XV

Weekly Gross Wages on Most Recent Job Held Prior to Application to JFK Center for JFK-Placed Respondents

Weekly Wage Category		Number	Percent
Under $50		2	4.2
50-59		8	16.7
60-69		3	6.2
70-79		5	10.4
80-89		4	8.3
90-99		4	8.3
100-109		4	8.3
110-119		5	10.4
120-129		6	12.5
130-139		3	6.2
140-149		3	6.2
150-159		1	2.1
Total		48	99.8
Employed Part-time		2	
Out of Labor Force		10	
No Data		8	
Total		68	
Mean Wage	$93.42		

Table XVa

Weekly Gross Wage on Most Recent Job Held Prior to Application to JFK Center For Self-Placed Respondents

Weekly Wage Category	Number	Percent
$50-59	8	23.5
60-69	1	2.9
70-79	4	11.8
80-89	1	2.9
90-99	-	--
100-109	3	8.9
110-119	-	--
120-129	4	11.8
130-139	1	2.9
140-149	1	2.9
150-159	-	--
160-169	3	8.9
170-179	1	2.9
180-189	1	2.9
190-199	4	11.8
200-209	-	--
230-239	2	5.9
Total	34	100.00
Employed Part-time	1	
Out of Labor Force	4	
No Data	13	
Total	52	

Mean Wage $116.26

Table XVb indicates the length of time the respondents reported they had been unemployed prior to applying at the Kennedy Center. In general, there is little difference between the two groups. Forty-one percent of both had been without work for six months or less. On the other hand, over 20 percent of the self-placed but about 10 percent of the JFK-placed were employed full time at the time of application.

Tables XVc and XVd were designed to show the extent to which long and short term unemployed were distributed in terms of the wage they received prior to applying to the Kennedy Center. It appears, however, that there was little difference between the self-placed and the JFK-placed in these cross distributions. This may again reflect the bi-modal character of the self-placed group.

Table XVI presents starting wage data on the JFK-placed jobs and Table XVIa includes starting and present wages on jobs held subsequent to the JFK contact for the self-placed. The self-placed had a starting mean wage of almost $85 while the JFK-placed jobs had a mean of $68.40. Table XVII includes data on the subset of Table XVI who were still employed at the time of the interview. Here the present wage mean of $84 is much closer to the self-placed mean of $89. But Table XVIII shows that those who remained on their JFK jobs had wages averaging $75 a week at the time of the interview.

The fifteen JFK-placed who left the JFK jobs and were subsequently employed full time (Table XIX) did the best of all with an average of $96 a week. It should again be pointed out that we got data on present wages from only twenty of the self-placed and it is not clear how this may bias our results.

Table XVb

Length of Time Unemployed Prior to Coming to the Kennedy Center

Length of Time Unemployed	JFK-Placed		Self-Placed		
	No.	%	No.	% of 52	% of 44
Less than 1 Week	1	1.5	1	1.9	2.3
1-2 weeks	1	1.5	1	1.9	2.3
3-4 weeks	2	2.9	0	-	-
1 Month	8	11.8	2	3.8	4.5
2 Months	2	2.9	4	7.8	9.1
3 Months	8	11.8	1	1.9	2.3
4-6 Months	6	8.8	9	17.3	20.4
7-9 Months	8	11.8	4	7.8	9.1
10-12 Months	6	8.8	3	5.8	6.8
13-18 Months	4	5.9	1	1.9	2.3
19-24 Months	2	2.9	1	1.9	2.3
More than 2 years	1	1.5	2	3.8	4.5
Out of Labor Force	10	14.5	4	7.8	9.1
Employed Full Time	7	10.3	10	19.2	22.8
Employed Part Time	2	2.9	1	1.9	2.3
No Data	-	-	8	15.4	-
Total	68	100.00	52	100.1	100.1

Table XVc

Employment Status at First Contact

(Classified by Gross Weekly Wage on Most Recent Job
Prior to Coming to Kennedy Center)

For JFK Placed

	Weekly Wage on Most Recent Job								
Employment Status	Under $50	50-69	70-89	90-109	110-129	130-149	$150 and over	No wage data available	TOTALS
Unemployed									
Less than 1 mo.	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	4/6.9%
1 - 2 mo.	0	4	2	0	2	1	1	0	10/17.2
3 - 6 mo.	0	0	5	3	2	2	0	2	14/24.1
7 - 12 mo.	1	1	1	3	4	1	0	3	14/24.1
13 - 18 mo.	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	4/6.9
More than 18 mo.	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3/5.2
Employed Full Time	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	2	7/12.2
Employed Part Time	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2/3.4%
Totals	3 5.2%	12 20.7	9 15.5	8 13.8	11 19.0	6 10.3	1 1.7	8 13.8	58 100.0%

Out of Labor Force	10
Total	68

Table XVd

Employment Status at First Contact

(Classified by Gross Weekly Wage on Most Recent Job
Prior to Coming to Kennedy Center)

For Self-Placed

Weekly Wage on Most Recent Job

Employment Status	Under $50	50-69	70-89	90-109	110-129	130-149	150-169	170 and over	No Wage Data	TOTALS
Unemployed										
Less than 1 mo.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2/5.0%
1 - 2 mo.	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	6/15.0
3 - 6 mo.	0	2	2	1	1	0	1	1	2	10/25.0
7 - 12 mo.	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7/17.5
13 - 18 mo.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1/2.5
More than 18 mo.	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	3/7.5
Employed Full Time	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	3	1	10/25.0
Employed Part Time	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1/2.5
Totals	0	9	5	3	4	2	3	8	6	40
	0%	22.5	12.5	7.5	10.0	5.0	7.5	20.0	15.0	100.0%

No Data	8
Out of Labor Force	4
Total	52

Table XVI

Starting Weekly Gross Wages for Job on Which Placed by JFK Center*

Weekly Wage	No.	%	Weekly Wage	No.	%
Under $50	7	10.3	110-119	1	1.5
50-59	6	8.8	120-129	0	
60-69	16	23.6	130-139	1	1.5
70-79	12	17.7	140-149	1	1.5
80-89	7	10.3	150-159	0	
90-99	2	2.9	No Data	12	17.7
100-109	3	4.3	Totals	68	100.1%
			Mean Wage	$68.40	

* Includes the four respondents who claim they were never placed on job by JFK and a small number of part-time placements.

Table XVIa

Present and Starting Gross Weekly Wages of Full-time Employed Self-placed Respondents on Jobs Found After Contact with Kennedy Center

Weekly Wage Category	Present Wage		Starting Wage	
	No.	%	No.	%
Under $50	0	-	0	-
50-59	7	35.0	8	40.0
60-69	2	10.0	1	5.0
70-79	1	5.0	2	10.0
80-89	2	10.0	2	10.0
90-99	2	10.0	2	10.0
100-109	1	5.0	0	-
110-119	1	5.0	2	10.0
120-129	1	5.0	0	-
130-139	0	-	0	-
140-149	1	5.0	1	5.0
170-179	1	5.0	2	10.0
180-189	1	5.0	0	-
Total	20	100.0	20	100.0
No data	32		32	
Total	52		52	
Mean Wage	$88.90		$84.85	

Table XVII

Present and Starting Gross Weekly Wages of Fulltime Employed Respondents Ever Placed on Jobs by JFK Center

Weekly Wage Category	Present Wage No.	Present Wage %	Starting Wage No.	Starting Wage %
$40-49	1	2.5	2	5.0
50-59	2	5.0	4	10.0
60-69	7	17.5	9	22.5
70-79	8	20.0	7	17.5
80-89	7	17.5	5	12.5
90-99	3	7.5	1	2.5
100-109	3	7.5	1	2.5
110-119	0	-	1	2.5
120-129	3	7.5	1	2.5
⋮				
160-169	2	5.0	2	5.0
No Data	4	10.0	7	17.5
Total	40	100.0	40	100.0
Not at Work	21		21	
Employed Part-time	7		7	
	68		68	
Mean Wage	$84		$75	

Table XVIII

Present and Starting Gross Weekly Wages of Respondents Still on Full-time JFK Jobs at the Time of the Interview

Weekly Wage Category	Present Wage No.	Present Wage %	Starting Wage No.	Starting Wage %
$50-59	2	9.1	3	13.6
60-69	4	18.2	5	22.7
70-79	5	22.7	6	27.3
80-89	5	22.7	4	18.2
90-99	2	9.1	0	
100-109	1	4.5	0	
No Data	3	13.6	4	18.2
Totals	22	99.9	22	100.0
Mean Wage	$75		$67	

Table XVIIIa

Wage Difference Between Most Recent Job Prior to Contact and JFK-Placed

(Classified by Length of Time Unemployed)

Employment Status	$30+ less	20-29 less	10-19 less	1-9 less	No Dif.	1-9 more	10-19 more	20-29 more	30+ more	Total
Unemployed										
Less than 1 mo.	2			1						3/9.4%
1-2 months		1	1	1	1	1	1			6/18.7
3-6 months	4	2				2		1		9/28.2
7-12 months	1	2	1		1	1		1		7/21.8
13-18 months	2		1							3/9.4
More than 18 mo.										
Employed Full Time	1			1	1			1		4/12.5
Totals	10 31.2	5 15.6	3 9.4	3 9.4	3 9.4	4 12.5	1 3.1	3 9.4		32/100

Employed Part Time (Before or after Contact)	8
Out of Labor Force	10
No data	18
Total	68

Table XVIIIb

Wage Difference Between Most Recent Job Prior to Contact and First Job After Contact with Kennedy Center for Self-Placed

(Classified by Length of Time Unemployed)

Employment Status	$30+ less	20-29 less	10-19 less	1-9 less	No Dif.	1-9 more	10-19 more	20-29 more	$30+ more	Total
Unemployed										
Less than 1 mo.									1	1/5.9%
1-2 months	1				1	1				3/17.6
3-6 months	2			1	1			1		5/29.4
7-12 months	1			2						3/17.6
13-18 months	1									1/5.9
More than 18 mo.	1									1/5.9
Employed Full Time			1		1	1				3/17.6
Totals	6 35.3		1 5.9	3 17.6	3 17.6	2 11.7		1 5.9	1 5.9	17/99.9

Employed Part Time (Before or after Contact)	1
Out of Labor Force	4
No Data	30
Total	52

Table XIX

Present Gross Weekly Wages of Responsents Who Had Left JFK Jobs But Were Employed at Subsequent Full-time Jobs at the Time of The Interview

Weekly Wage Category	No.	%
$60-69	3	20.0
70-79	3	20.0
80-89	1	6.7
90-99	1	6.7
100-109	2	13.3
110-119	0	
120-129	2	13.3
⋮		
160-169	2	13.3
No Data	1	6.7
Totals	15	100.0
Mean Wage	$96	

Tables XIXA-XX report the training the respondents reported receiving for any previous jobs and for their present job.

Table XIXA

Previous Job Training

Type of Training	JFK-Placed		Self-Placed	
	No.	%	No.	%
In High School	0		0	
Post-High School Vocational School	8	11.8	5	9.6
M.D.T.A. Institutional	4	5.9	0	
M.D.T.A. on-the-job	0		0	
Formal on-the-job	2	2.9	2	3.8
Informal on-the-job	8	11.8	3	5.8
None	46	67.7	40	77.0
No Data	0		2	3.8
Total	68	100.0	52	100.0

Table XVIIIa and XVIIIb include data on wage differences between jobs held before and after contact with the Center. As the previous talbes would suggest, both groups were forced to take pay cuts in many cases. There did not, however, seem to be any generalized pattern in regard to the size of the difference in wages and the length of time unemployed.

Table XX

Training Received by Employed Respondents for Present Job

Type of Training	JFK-Placed		Self-Placed	
	No.	%	No.	%
M.D.T.A. Institutional	2	4.3	0	
M.D.T.A. On-the-job	0		0	
Formal On-the-job	1	2.1	0	
Informal On-the-job	5	10.7	1	2.3
None	39	82.9	42	95.4
No Data	0	____	1	2.3
Total	47	100.0	44	100.0

Only a handful of respondents reported receiving any job training for any of their jobs and this carries over into their present job experience. The latter fact should come as no surprise in light of the Kennedy Center's attitude toward training and its lack of importance in the success of an older worker project.

The Kennedy Center is a multi-service agency and supposedly its speical competence is in the area of dealing with all the problems of its clients, not just their employment problems. In our interviews we asked the respondents what services they had received from the Center. Table XXI reports the answers.

Table XXI

Additional Services Recieved by Respondents from JFK Center (in addition, that is, to placement services for JFK placed)

Services Received	JFK-Placed		Self-Placed	
	No.	%	No.	%
Legal	0		0	
Counseling	3	4.4	5	9.6
Testing	2	2.9	0	
None	63	92.8	47	90.5
Total	68	100.1	52	100.1

In one limited sense this is not quite fair since many more than three of the JFK placed, at least, received employment counseling from Mrs. Francis or Mr. Walker. They did not recognize what they did get as counseling. On the other hand, every placement agency provides this service in greater or less amounts.

The striking fact is, that virtually none of the respondents could report anything to indicate that a multi-service approach to their problems had been implemented. And this must be viewed in the context that the multi-service approach is what differentiates the operation of an agency like the Kennedy Center from, say, the offices of the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security.

In their own final report the Kennedy Center presented the following table and discussion.

Table XXII[13]

Frequencies and Percentages of Male and Female Applicants Classified According to Other Kennedy Center Services Used

Other Kennedy Center Services Used	Male		Female		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Legal Assistance	1	.33	10	7.69	11	2.53
Family Counseling	2	.66	1	.77	3	.67
Surplus Food	0	0.00	3	2.31	3	.69
No Information	302	99.01	116	89.23	418	96.09
Total	305	100.00	130	100.00	435	100.00

"Table 31 (XXII) summarizes the immediately accessible data pertaining to the use of the other multi-serivces of the Kennedy Center by job applicants. Seventeen applicants' folders showed that these additional services had been utilized. These figures do not accurately reflect the situation because of the limitations of staffing a newly organized complex of services, coordinating the programming of such services and implementing an intra-agency record keeping system that would reflect the interplay of such services. Despite such administrative and operational impediments, however, observation and experience has demonstrated that a substantially larger number of applicants were given legal assistance, individual and family counseling, psychological consultations and other Kennedy Center serivces. The full impact and benefits of such immediately available services and resources did not begin to be realized until late in the term of the Older Worker Contract."

---

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 158-9, Table 31, p. 159.

While our data suppport the findings reported in the table, we did not come in contact with that "...substantially larger number of applicants (who) were given legal assistance, individual and family counselling...."

E. EMPLOYER REACTION TO THE OLDER WORKER PROGRAM

The data for this section come from two sources. The Kennedy Center, in its self-assessment conducted a mail questionnaire and interview program with 74 firms at which it had made placements. These employers had hired 141 Kennedy Center applicants.

We supplemented this program with our own intensive discussions with thirty employers who had been contacted by the Center in its employment project. Fifteen of these had hired Kennedy Center applicants and fifteen had not. These two samples were selected at random from lists supplied by the Center. Sixty firms had hired Center applicants during the first year of the program and 275 additional firms were contacted but accepted no applicants. Thus our samples represent 25% and 5.5% of their respective universes.[14]

The following table indicates the employment size breakdown of the two samples. There is no substantial difference between the two samples in this regard. We also were not able to find any major differences in the industry classifications of the firms in the two samples.

While it is obvious that all the firms we contacted had some knowledge about the Kennedy Center's placement program, we were interested to find out what, if anything, they had learned about the other services such as job and family counselling, legal assistance, etc. It turned out that three of the firms or 10% had some knowledge of these non-placement aspects of the Center's program.

---

14. For a more thorough analysis of this interview program see Svein Reichborn-Kjennerud, "Employment Counseling and Placement of Older Workers: A Program Evaluation," Unpublished Masters Thesis, Sloan School of Management, M.I.T., 1966.

Table XXIII

Employment Size Categories of Sample of Firms that Did and Did Not Hire Kennedy Center Applicants

Employment Size Category	Firms that Hired Through JFK		Firms that did not Hire Through JFK	
	No.	%	No.	%
1-9 employees	1	6.7	1	6.7
10-19 "	2	13.3	0	0.0
20-49 "	2	13.3	5	33.3
50-99 "	3	20.0	0	0.0
100-249 "	1	6.7	5	33.3
250-499 "	2	13.3	1	6.7
500-999 "	2	13.3	0	0.0
1000and over	2	13.3	3	20.0
Totals	15	99.9	15	100.0

The question we put to the employers in this regard was the following: "I understand that the John F. Kennedy Family Service Center has been doing work in these areas (screening, counselling and retraining of older workers). Do you have any specific knowledge about their efforts? Specify__________"

The Center's question was somewhat different: "Are you familiar with the program at the John F. Kennedy Family Service Center? Yes____ No____." And their responses are classified on the basis of hired applicants, not on the basis of firms. The replies to their question are tabulated in Table XXIV.

Table XXIV

Familiarity with Program at JFK Center

Familiarity With Program	No.	%
Yes	134	95.0
No	1	0.7
No Reply	6	4.3
Total	141	100.0

The fifteen firms we interviewed had hired thirty-five applicants from the Kennedy Center. Of these, sixteen were still employed and the employers had no specific complaints about any of these. Nineteen had separated from their companies and ten of these did so voluntarily. Some, in fact, were only temporary workers hired for the Christmas season. Of the nine remaining the following reasons were given for the involuntary separations.

Table XXV

Reasons Cited by Employers for Involuntary Separation of Persons Hired Through JFK Center

Reason Cited	No.	%
Low mentality, poor performance	5	55.5
Alcoholism, Sex offender	2	22.2
Laziness	1	11.1
Didn't Remember	1	11.1
Total	9	99.9

The Kennedy Center's data provide information on both voluntary and involuntary separations of the 74 people who had left their first JFK placed job. This is out of a total of 141 placed or 52.5% - very close to the separation percentage in the other sample of 54.3. The following table indicates the reason for leaving the job.

Twenty-three of the thirty establishments we interviewed had had applicants referred to them by the Kennedy Center and not hired them.[15] The employers were able to cite a number of reasons for not hiring these workers and the list is similar to what one would undoubtedly find from a

---

15. This number includes the fifteen in the "did not hire" category plus eight in the "did hire" group who had turned down one or more additional Kennedy Center applicants.

Table XXVI

Reasons for Leaving JFK placed Jobs According to Employers

Reasons for Separation	No.	%
Could not do work physically	14	18.9
Termination - no Reason Offered	16	21.6
Not Mentally Able	9	12.2
Lack of Confidence	1	1.4
Illness	4	5.4
Job Terminated	1	1.4
Did not Want to Work	7	9.5
Quit for Better Job	6	8.1
No Response	16	21.6
Totals	74	100.1

general survey of hiring standards and employment activity. For example: 1) Low level of verbal aptitude; 2) Untidy appearance; 3) Past employment record unstable; 4) Applicant too old for physical aspects of the job; 5) Personality problem (including alcoholic problems); 6) Applicant was overqualified; 7) Applicant requested too high a salary; etc.

We asked the respondents to give their suggestions for improvement of the Center's operations. Their views in this regard are presented in Table XXVII.

Twenty-seven of the thirty employers we interviewed had experienced steady or increasing employment over the last five years and the three with decreasing employment were in the group that had not hired Kennedy Center referrals (see Table XXVIII).

Table XXVII

Suggestions for Improvements in the Operation of the JFK Center

Suggestions	Respondents Making Suggestion			
	Firms that Hired Through JFK		Firms that did not Hire Through JFK	
	No.	%	No.	%
More Advertising and Follow-up to employers	6	40.0	8	53.4
Better Screening and Reference Checks	11	73.4	2	13.3
Better Counseling and Retraining	3	20.0	6	40.0
Mail out more resumes to Employers	2	13.3	5	33.3
More Research on Demand for Labor in Area	5	33.3	2	13.3
Send out more referrals	0	-	1	6.7
Get out of Charlestown	0	-	1*	6.7
Center is fine just the way it is	1	6.7	0	___
Totals	28	186.7	25	166.7

Totals do not add to 100% because some employers made more than one suggestion.

* This was not from an employer in Charlestown.

Table XXVIII

Employment Trends Over Last Five Years

Employment Trend	Number of Establishments Reporting			
	Those that Hired Through JFK		Those that did not hire Through JFK	
	No.	%	No.	%
Increasing	10	66.7	7	56.7
Steady	5	33.3	5	33.3
Decreasing	0	-	3	10.0
Totals	15	100.0	15	100.0

Most of the respondents reported that they had recently experienced difficulty in filling job openings in all or certain occupational areas. (See Table XXIX.) In some of the firms maintenance work had been contracted out because of labor shortages in this area. A majority stressed the general tightness of the labor market and lack of available, qualified workers (presumably at given wage rates).

Table XXIX

Recent Difficulties Encountered in Filling Job Openings

Difficulty Encountered	Firms that Hired Through JFK		Firms that did Not Hire Through JFK	
	No.	%	No.	%
YES				
In all occupations	3	20.0	7	46.7
In Skilled only	3	20.0	2	13.3
In Semi-skilled only	1	6.7	2	13.3
In Unskilled only	2	13.3	1	6.7
In Professional and Clerical only	5	33.3	1	6.7
NO	1	6.7	2	13.3
Totals	15	100.0	15	100.0

The respondents were asked their views as to the merits of hiring older workers in general, outside the context of a tight labor market. This issue had to be approached with considerable care since the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has a fair employment statute prohibiting discrimination in employment on the basis of age.

Six of the thirty employers revealed no discriminatory attitudes toward older workers and as one would expect, five of these were in the group that had been willing to hire through the Center. Three of the six firms preferred older workers for certain classes of employment. For example, a girls' college had a preference for older maintenance men since they were less likely to bother the students.

Other firms, however, expressed a number of reservations about hiring older people. They cited such factors as inflexibility, frequency of sickness, their generally lower educational attainment, and so on. Then, from a company policy point of view there were such impediments to hiring older workers as promotion from within policies, insurance and profit sharing plans and a need for long term employees. In this regard one employer felt that if he hired an older worker for a job it would require that he take a lower wage than that earned on a previous job and he felt that this would lead to poor morale and a dissatisfied employee.

It is apparent that in a majority of cases these firms would take on older workers only reluctantly. The fact that some did despite this reluctance can probably be traced primarily to the fact that almost all the firms had experienced some difficulty in filling job openings because of relatively tight labor market conditions. (See Table XXX).

Table XXX

Unemployment Rate in Boston SMSA During the Period of the JFK Center Contract and the Year Earlier Period (Unadjusted)

Unemployment Rate During Period of Contract		Month	Unemployment Rate Year Earlier	
4.7	1965	March	1964	5.6
4.1		April		4.9
3.6		May		4.3
4.4		June		5.1
4.4		July		5.0
4.0		August		4.6
3.4		September		4.2
3.3		October		3.9
3.4		November		4.0
3.4		December		4.1
3.9	1966	January	1965	5.1
3.9		February		4.7
3.9		March		4.7
3.4		April		4.1
3.6		May		3.6
4.1		June		4.4
3.8		Mean Rate		4.5

F. CONCLUSIONS

Was the Kennedy Center's Older Worker Project a success? The answer depends on the standards that are used in making the assessment. The Center staff clearly feels that the project was successful and apparently the Department of Labor does as well since the Center's older worker contract was renewed for an eighteen month period. There were some notable achievements but there were also some unattained goals.

The Center placed a substantial number of its applicants, 157 or 36.1%, if only direct placements are counted (as I think they should be) plus 104 indirect placements. The wages on the placement jobs, while in general lower than the earnings of those who were employed prior to applying at the Center, are not substantially out of line. It was interesting that those who did best financially were the ones who left their JFK jobs and moved on to other employment. Although the job after the JFK placement had a higher wage it might be argued that the Center should be given special credit because it introduced or reintroduced a worker to the job market who then went on with his own efforts to continue to improve his economic position.

Moreover, the Center should be credited with recruiting two very able placement counselors. We never heard anything but complimentary comments about Mary Francis and Angus Walker from both our worker and employer respondents. These two were personally responsible for one of the intangible but nonetheless significant accomplishments of the Project. A large number of these older workers had either been out of the labor force or employed on one job for many years. As a result when they were forced into the labor market they faced the prospect of looking for a job with anxiety and insecurity. According to many respondents Mrs. Francis and Mr. Walker performed a genuine service by reducing these anxieties and bolstering their morale. This is reflected to some extent in Table XXXI.

On the other hand, the Center was unable to achieve some of its original objectives. The effort to develop on-the-job training slots was virtually a fiasco. MDTA training programs were not exploited for a number of reasons. And the attempt to compare the placement activity of the Center with that of the D.E.S. was a failure. Only in this last case can the blame be assigned with confidence. D.E.S. officials made it clear that it would have been grossly unfair to compare the results of their regular activities with those of the specialized Kennedy Center. Consequently the project was strangled within D.E.S.

But the most distressing aspect of the project in my view was the apparent inability of the Center to implement substantively the multi-service approach to the problems of older workers. Virtually no respondents received any but placement services according to both our interviews and the Kennedy Center's records.

What makes this more discouraging is that it was the multi-service aspect of its approach to the problem that differentiated the Center from the State Employment Service. Certainly the applicants at the Center were in a more congenial atmosphere; they dealt with warmer-hearted, more understanding and able placement counsellors than would have been the case had they gone to the D.E.S. But these are differences in degree, not in kind, and the Center was to be a new kind of agency.

Table XXXI

Respondents' Reaction to Treatment and Service Received at Kennedy Center

Reaction	JFK-Placed		Self-Placed	
	No.	%	No.	%
Very favorable	16	23.6	6	11.5
Favorable	48	70.6	28	53.9
Unfavorable	4	5.9	16	30.8
No Data	0	--	2	3.8
Totals	68	100.1	52	100.0

One final aspect of the environment should be mentioned again. The employer data we collected indicated that the market was characterized by labor shortages. While the Boston unemployment rates may not seem low when compared to those in Gary, Chicago, or Milwaukee*, it should be recognized that the Boston rate has traditionally not been too volatile. In late 1965 and 1966 it began what for Boston was a significant drop. (Annual averages: 1962, 4.6%; 1963, 4.7%; 1964, 4.8%; 1965, 4.1%; 1966, 3.6%).

This factor clearly affected the ability of the Center to make placements and some of the employers we interviewed were almost desperate for help in certain occupations. The relatively low unemployment rate also may have reduced the attractiveness of training, both formal on-the-job and MDTA institutional. As one employer told a Kennedy Center staff man, "Forget about the training, just send us the workers."

In summation, it seems to me that the notion of a multi-service approach to the employment problems of older workers is a conceptually attractive one. It is also the most significant aspect of the potential contribution an agency such as the Kennedy Center can make to the solution of such problems because the Center was apparently uniquely qualified in this regard. It may simply be the case that a multi-service approach is very difficult to administer. Consequently, with a staff forced to spend its time establishing a new project in a new agency, and faced with pressure to make placements, it was impossible to implement this approach in the first sixteen months of the program. I would expect to find a much more impressive record in this regard as the Center's current older worker project proceeds.

---

* It is dangerous to make inter-area comparisons in any case.

G. APPENDIX

1. Costs of the Older Worker Project

The following table presents the expenditures involved in the Boston Older Worker Project. There are two possible ways to analyze these cost data. First, if we are interested in the performance of the Kennedy Center, we should isolate the costs incurred in their administration of the Project. Second, for some purposes it may be useful to include all costs incurred for the Project and include the ABCD expenditures.

Kennedy Center Expenditures

From the Kennedy Center's point of view, the Older Worker Project began in March, 1965, and it could be argued that any assessment of its operation should exclude expenditures made by the ABCD. Further, the Center spent virtually all of its staff time in the last three months of the Project on a self-assessment, and it is thus reasonable to reduce the total expenditures by a factor to take account of this.

Thus, in the fifteen-month period from April 1, 1965 to June 30, 1966, twelve months were spent directly on placement activity. Eighty percent (12/15) of the expenditures can be charged to placement, but there were some direct costs associated with the self-assessment which should also be excluded. These are the consultant's fees of $3,190 in personnel expenses and the $600 printing expense for the final report. This leaves personnel expenditures of $63,970.40 and other costs of $20,360.80 for a total of $84,331.20. Eighty percent of this total is $67,464.96.

The expenditure per client for the total of 479 clients, (See Table IV, p. 80, above) is then $141. Using the placement figure in that table of 316, the cost per placement was $213.50. But this, it seems to me, is an unrealistic placement figure since it includes indirect placements (see discussion on pages 79-80). The indirect placements were people who in many cases had only a casual or brushing contact with the Center. Many of the indirect placements (or self-placed in our classification) said they had received absolutely no service from the Center.

A more appropriate estimate of the placement activity would be direct placements (see Table V, p. 81) of which there were 157. The cost per placement using this figure is $430.

2. ABCD Plus Kennedy Center Expenditures

If an assessment is being made of the entire Boston Older Worker Project rather than of the Kennedy Center's performance, then it would be appropriate to include the costs incurred by ABCD prior to the establishment of the Kennedy Center. In my view, however, it still would be incorrect to include the costs associated with the Center's self-assessment. The total cost of the Project is then $85,422.40 ($67,464.96 + $17,957.44), resulting in the following average costs:

Cost per client	$178
Cost per total placements	$270
Cost per direct placement	$594.

Expenditures on Boston Older Worker Project

9/23/64 - 6/30/66

	Budget	ABCD Expenditures	Kennedy Center Expenditures	Budget Balance
Wages	$ 77,600.00	$ 16,189.12	$ 57,429.93	$ 3,980.95
Fringe Benefits	7,760.00	620.76	6,540.47	598.77
Consultants	4,000.00	---	3,190.00	810.00
Total Personnel	$ 89,360.00	$ 16,809.88	$ 67,160.40	$ 5,398.72
Other Expenses				
Consumable Supplies	$ 151.00	$ 151.30	$ 0.00	$ .30
Travel	2,300.00	239.55	1,436.32	624.13
Rent	8,000.00	458.25	9,532.50	1,990.75
Telephone	208.00	208.08	---	.08
Miscellaneous	---	90.38	---	90.38
Equipment Repairs	---	---	152.60	152.60
Books and Periodicals	100.00	---	16.20	83.80
Advertising	500.00	---	460.20	39.80
Accounting and Payroll	2,000.00	---	2,000.00	---
Kennedy Center Administration	8,976.00	---	6,062.98	2,913.02
O.J.T. Fund	17,500.00	---	700.00	16,800.00
Printing Final Report	---	---	600.00	600.00
Total Other Costs	$ 39,735.00	$ 1,147.56	$ 20,960.80	$17,626.64
TOTAL	$129,095.00	$ 17,957.44	$ 88,121.20	$23,016.36

The Older Worker project in Buncombe County, North Carolina

By

Juanita Kreps

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
A.	THE CONTRACT	125
B.	THE AREA: GEOGRAPHIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	127
C.	THE TARGET GROUP	133
D.	TRAINING, COUNSELLING AND PLACEMENT	137
E.	EVALUATION	152
F.	CONCLUSION	160

A. THE CONTRACT

The contract for Project GROW (Growth for Rural Older Workers), nc 82-32-71, between the Labor Department andthe Buncombe County Committee on Aging, was signed June 26, 1965. The Committee was composed of several citizens whose work was related to employment or other problems of older people, or who were active in community affairs in a broader context. The Committee chairman, a physician, assumed direction when the contract was being negotiated and continued to give the Project an enormous amount of time throughout its operation.

As an experimental and demonstration program, the project attempted to

> ...serve a minimum of 300 individuals living in the rural area of Buncombe and Madison counties who are 50 years of age or older, and are either unemployed or underemployed. Of this 300 to be served, in degrees varying with their needs, an estimated 100 persons will be selected for referral to institutional or on-the-job training programs under Manpower Development and Training Act. Other experimental and demonstration features of this project are:
>
> A. To experiment with and demonstrate that vocational counseling techniques and supportive services can increase the success of training and vocational adjustment of the geographically isolated older rural worker.

B. To explore the special techniques, in involving cooperative efforts of community agencies needed for the successful identification, motivation, training, and vocational adjustment of older rural workers.

C. To determine the kind of job opportunities that can be created in a dominately rural community for the local rural older worker.

D. To explore the jobs which can be obtained locally for which there will be an increased demand and which gives full recognition to the special qualifications of the mountain resident.

E. To determine the effects of using the services and facilities of a prosperous urban community to lift up economically the surrounding rural areas.

F. To determine how efforts on behalf of rural older workers can be coordinated with and not competitive to efforts on behalf of Appalachian young workers.

G. To develop criteria that can be used in predicting and determining whether a rural Southern Appalachian area can be expected to respond successfully to the re-development of the ARA, MDTA, community action, and similiar programs.[1]

---

[1] Project GROW, Second Bi-Monthly Report, December 11, 1965-Februray 11, 1966, pp. 1-2.

Another feature of this project was the inclusion in the contract of participation by the Employment Security Commission. An Employment Interviewer and an Employment Counselor were to be attached to the project staff to do the employment counseling, aptitude testing, referral to training, follow-up on training, job development, and placement.

For various reasons, the goals outlined above were only partially realized.

B. THE AREA: GEOGRAPHIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

An important factor in the planning of the project was the relation of the rural areas to Asheville, a city of 60,000. The contract stated that it was desirable "to determine the effects of using the services and facilities of a prosperous urban community to lift up economically the surrounding rural areas." However, much of the target area is remote and virtually inaccesible to the Asheville area. Many of the residents live on isolated, unpaved mountain roads and are entirely dependent on others for their transportation. The type of countryside and the state of public transportation render "miles" an inadequate measure of distance. The presence and relative accessibility of Asheville within Buncombe County has undoubtedly affected employment and income opportunities there; the extent becomes clear in a comparison with the predominantly rural, agriculturally-oriented Madison County.

While the two counties are geographically quite similar - mountainous, with remote, isolated section - there are important differences in their economic and demographic characteristics. In 1960, the population of Madison County was 17,217; that of Buncombe County, 130,074, almost half of which is accounted for by the city of Asheville. The civilian labor force in Buncombe County at the same time was estimated to be approximately 39 percent of the population, while that of Madison County was about 31 percent. The lower labor force participation rate in Madison County appears to be the result of a combination of such factors as the scarcity of the non-agricultural employment opportunities, available near Asheville, the lack of transportation, and the isolation of parts of the county from the Asheville area. The median annual money income in Madison County in 1960 was $2,007 - less than half the Buncombe County median of $4,419. While the employment situation in both counties improved between 1962 and 1966, in Buncombe County the improvement was considerably greater. During this period unemployment in Buncombe County dropped from 5.5 percent to 3.0 percent and in Madison County from 9.9 percent to 7.5 percent. Work force, total employment, and nonagricultural employment all expanded to a greater extent in Buncombe than in Madison County. Table 1 shows that in Buncombe County the work force increased 17.4 percent between 1962 and 1966 (an average annual increase of 3.3 percent) but the increase in the work force in Madison County was limited to 6.5 percent (an annual rate of 1.0 percent). From 1962 through 1966 employment increased 20.6 percent in Buncombe County (an annual rate of 3.8 percent) and only 9.3 per cent (an annual rate of 1.8 per cent) in Madison County. These figures disguise the seasonal variation common to both counties. The work force and total employment are at a maximum in the summer months, declining through the remainder of the year and reaching a trough in December-January. In February-March employment swings up and the work force peaks again in the summer months. Reasons commonly used to explain this seasonal variation in employment are the nature of agricultural employment and the magnitude of the tourist industry of the area.

Table 1. Labor force, employment, and unemployment in Buncombe and Madison Counties, 1962-1966.

Madison County

Year	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Total percentage chng. 1962-66	Average annual rate of increase
Labor force	4,405	4,670	4,565	4,475	4,690	6.46%	1.0%
Total Employment	3,970	4,220	4,110	4,129	4,340	9.31%	1.8%
Non-agricultural Employment	1,635	1,725	1,615	1,625	1,780	8.86%	1.7%
Unemployment	435	450	455	350	350		
Rate of Unemployment	9.9%	9.6%	10.0%	7.8%	7.5%		

Table 1 (con't.)

Year	Buncombe County 1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	Total percentage chng. 1962-66	Average annual rate of increase
Labor force	53,730	56,135	58,275	60,320	63,066	17.37%	3.3%
Total Employment	50,750	53,300	55,610	58,100	61,200	20.59%	3.8%
Non-agricultural Employment	42,575	43,970	45,880	48,560	51,837	21.75%	4.0%
Unemployment	2,980	2,835	2,665	2,220	1,866		
Rate of Unemployment	5.5%	5.0%	4.6%	3.7%	3.7%		

Source: Employment Security Commission of North Carolina

In both counties increases in the non-agricultural sector were important in explaining the decrease in unemployment. Non-agricultural employment increased more rapidly than total employment in Buncombe County, probably due in great part to expanding opportunities in Asheville. Comparing 1966 with 1962, non-agricultural employment was up 21.8 per cent (an annual rate of 4.0 per cent), while total employment expanded 20.6 per cent. In Madison County, however, the increase in non-agricultural employment lagged behind the increase in total employment. Again comparing 1962 with 1966, non-agricultural employment rose 8.9 per cent (an annual rate of 1.7 per cent), whereas total employment increased 9.3 per cent. While in Buncombe County non-agricultural employment as a percentage of total employment increased slightly between 1962 and 1966 (from 83.8 per cent of total employment to 84.7 per cent), the percentage in Madison County actually dropped: from 41.2 per cent in 1962 to 41.0 per cent in 1966. It is worth noting that non-agricultural employment has accounted for more than 4/5 of the employment in Buncombe County, and just over 2/5 in Madison County.

Education is another factor which helps to explain the lower figures for Madison County. The median number of years of school completed in the United States is 10.6. In North Carolina the median is 8.5; for Buncombe County the median is 10.4 years, but for Madison County it is only 7.7.[2]

A large proportion of Buncombe County high school graduates continue their education and thus postpone entry into the labor force. Table 2 shows the post-high school status of the graduates. In Buncombe County 55.8 per cent of those graduated plan to continue their education, all others being available to enter the labor force[3] or military service. But in Madison County the proportion of high school graduates continuing their education is only 40.5 per cent. As long as this pattern persists the educational attainment of the labor force in Madison County will remain below that of the state in general. The implications for employment prospects are obvious.

---

[2] Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book, 1962.

[3] The potential number of high school graduates available to enter the labor force and the actual number entering will not coincide, as some females will not enter the labor force because of household responsibilities.

Table 2. Numbers of high school graduates and their post-high school status, recent years.

Year	Total	Continuing education		Entering military service		Available for the labor force	
		no.	/per cent	no.	/per cent	no.	/per cent
			Buncombe County				
1963	1,274	753	59%	52	4%	469	37%
1964	1,490	829	56%	75	5%	586	39%
1965	2,013	1,063	53%	74	4%	875	44%
1966	1,936	1,103	57%	75	4%	758	39%
			Madison County				
1963	197	71	36%	19	10%	107	54%
1964	194	83	45%	9	5%	92	50%
1965	185	65	35%	6	3%	114	62%
1966	199	91	46%	6	3%	102	51%

Source: Employment Security Commission of North Carolina.

As Table 1 indicates, the recent unemployment rate in Madison County is more than twice the rate in Buncombe County. In view of the seasonal nature of some employment and the more prosperous situation in Buncombe County, one might hypothesize that the unemployed in Madison County could be partly absorbed, at least in the peak seasons, into the work force of Buncombe County. However, our data on unemployment and the remarks of persons familiar with the local labor market suggest that such an absorption of the unemployed Madison County worker is unlikely.

C. THE TARGET GROUP

1. General Considerations

The sponsoring committee and the staff anticipated some of the special qualities of their clients prior to the beginning of the recruitment. Based on opinions of persons who had previously worked with low-income mountain families, the committee hypothesized that

> A major number of those to whom we should like to appeal will be reticent, hard to communicate with initially, reluctant to acklowledge their need of special services we wish to offer, and in some cases hostile or at least indifferent to approach. ...These are true mountain people, with all their prejudices, pride, suspicion, and love of the land intact, and in some instances with an unyielding belief that the mores of the past generations have firmly established the direction and the limits within which the present and even the future generations may and should move.[4]

In searching for project staff, the Committee assumed that these characteristics required special understanding. They sought counselors from the area, with background that would enable them to gain the confidence of persons who were not expected to take kindly to counselling; who might "indignantly refuse testing and only grudgingly participate" in the program. Counseling sessions were not expected to be the usual interviews; instead,

---

[4] First Periodic Report of the Buncombe County Committee on Aging, September 9, 1965, p. 3.

> The terrain, the immobility which they have adopted as a way of life, physical impairments, reluctance to leave the homestead -- these and perhaps more compelling reasons may arise, making it necessary to perform most of our counseling efforts on ridge-top farmhouse porches and other unlikely sites.[5]

Actual experience of the counselors bore out some of these fears. Discouraging results of attempts to interest sub-marginal farmers in training for alternative employment sometimes led to the conclusion that there appeared to be little desire to improve circumstances.

> These few seem to be satisfied to live in their "shacks," contented with the income of a small tobacco allotment, and use the remainder of their time hunting, fishing, and visiting neighbors. It does not seem to bother them not to have transportation or money. Theypreserve beans, tomatoes, and

---

[5] Ibid., p. 3. This was precisely where they took place.

> other garden vegetables, along with the blackberries that grow in the area. Quite often they raise cows, pigs, and chickens for their own home use.[6]

Getting the older people to come into the project office was in itself a major problem. Working from names supplied by the Madison County Welfare Department , contacts were made and interviews scheduled. Frequently, appointments were not kept and follow-up by the social work counselors elicited numerous reasons: too busy, prospect of employment in the near future, conflicts with work at home, sickness, changed their minds. Unexpressed reasons, the counselors noted, were probably lack of confidence, fear of involvement, unsuitable clothing, fear that the project was a "hand-out." Additional names were drawn from ES records, but the problem of getting the unemployed to appear for interviews was just as pronounced. Leads on still other eligible persons were given by neighbors, relatives, community storekeepers, school principles, and ministers. At one point early in the project a social counselor who was well known in the area was hired to work on the project, and this served to encourage some older persons to appear on their own initiative.

---

[6] Project GROW, Second Bi-Monthly Report, December 13, 1965 - February 11, 1966, p. 4.

2. Specific Characteristics

Despite the difficulties encountered, a substantial number of people were interviewed during the first ten months of the contract. Records were kept which indicate that 215 persons were contacted by July 1, 1966. Recruitment was delayed for certain periods during this time because of uncertainty over extension of the contract beyond September 29, 1966, and the fear that the project would be unable to continue. When an extension was granted, the project workers concentrated on recruiting, but kept no records, so the total number contacted is unknown. It seems clear that the target of 300 people could have been contacted and interviewed, given adequate staffing and assurance that retraining would actually be forthcoming.

Certain characteristics of these older persons should be noted. Almost two-thirds of the people contacted initially were women (130 out of 214); their mean age was 56.0. The men were a somewhat older group, with a mean age of 59.2. The educational level was low: mean years of education for both sexes was 6.8. For females, mean level of education was 7.1 years; for males, 6.3 years.

Less than 40 per cent of all those contacted were employed: forty-eight out of eighty-three men were employed; of the remainder, twenty-four were not in the labor force, primarily because of age or disability. Ninety per cent of those who were employed gave their occupation as farmer. This usually meant farming a small tobacco allotment, and perhaps some tomatoes and vegetables. The mean earnings of the males who reported earnings were $1,050 per year.

Only 28 of the 131 females were employed (21.4 per cent). Most of the remaining group were not in the labor force, since they either listed their primary occupation as housewife or had not worked for a number of years. The information on income for females was far too sketchy to permit estimates.

D. TRAINING, COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT

In accordance with the contract, the project aimed to provide counseling and job training to workers over 50, and also to determine the kinds of jobs that can be created in a rural community for older workers.

From the group of 215 persons initially contacted, and the subsequent group on whom no records were kept, thirteen women went into cooking class and nineteen women took sewing, two evenings a week for twenty weeks.[7] Strictly speaking, these cooking and sewing trainees were the only ones receiving training under Project GROW, and even these classes were not job-oriented, as the subsequent discussinn indicates.

In order to evaluate the effects of the training carried on by Project GROW, it was necessary to wait until at least six weeks had elapsed after the completion of the job training. Interviews were scheduled with as many trainees as possible among those who were

---

[7] The total number attending these classes was larger, but not all students were Project GROW clients.

Table 3. Number and Employment Status of Initial Contacts, by sex and years of education.

Years of Education	Number Contacted		Percent of total	Employment Status: Employed Number	Employed Percent	Unemp. or not in labor force Number	Unemp. or not in labor force Percent
0	Both sexes	5	2.3%	2	40.0%	3	60.0%
	male	4		2	50.0%	2	50.0%
	female	1		0	-	1	100.0%
1-4	Both sexes	46	21.4%	13	28.3%	33	71.7%
	male	17		11	64.7%	6	35.3%
	female	29		2	69.0%	27	31.0%
5-8	Both sexes	104	48.4%	42	41.3%	62	58.7%
	male	47		28	59.6%	19	40.4%
	female	57		14	29.8%	43	70.2%
9-12	Both sexes	54	25.1%	19	35.2%	35	64.8%
	male	12		7	58.3%	5	41.7%
	female	42		13	31.0%	29	69.0%
over 12	Both sexes	6	2.8%	1	16.7%	5	83.3%
	male	3		0	-	3	100.0%
	female	3		1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Totals		215	100.0%	77	35.8%	138	64.2%

Table 3a. Age of Initial Contacts

Mean age	
Both sexes	57.3
males	59.2
females	56.0

Sources: Data from project workers' forms D/L-D/HEW MT-101.

employed and those who were unemployed. A few of the people who had received on-the-job training or direct placement in jobs were also interviewed. Half a dozen men who had been referred to training classes in the building of tomato trellisies were not interviewed, since these men were either still in training or had just completed the course.

To supplement this information, interviews were also scheduled with some persons whom Project GROW had recruited for adult education classes. These interviews include some persons who had gone into cooking and sewing classes after adult education, as well as some who had not. The project director made arrangements with the project workers to have the three interviewers introduced to the clients. Interviewers were dependent on project personnel for the selection and number of clients to be interviewed.

1. Training and Job Placement

Three institutional training classes, which each ran for twenty weeks, were begun in the latter part of September and early October, 1966: sewing in Marshall and Mars Hill, and a cooking class in Marshall. Four basic education classes of ten weeks each were begun in May, 1966, in Ebbs Chapel, Mars Hill, Hot Springs, and Marshall. A new set, in which there are of course no Project GROW clients, although many of the same people are finding their own transportation and attending, began in April, 1967.

The Project recruited students for these classes, and provided transportation. No payments of any sort were made to the trainees.

Some Project GROW clients were referred to two classes in the building of tomato trellises (one in Marshall and one in Hot Springs) which began in February, 1967, to run for six weeks. These trainees did receive allowances under the MDTA.

Thirty-one women and one man were interviewed. Information relating to employment status, education, and income is summarized in Tables 4 and 5. The preponderance of women is attributable to the nature of the courses offered. The interviewees came mostly from the cooking and sewing classes, which were the only training classes initiated by Project GROW; the lone male was attending an adult education class. Most of the residents of Marshall were contacted in their homes, which gave us an opportunity to form an opinion of their standard of living. Five were interviewed while they were attending an adult education class. Those who had attended classes in Mars Hill met us in the Mars Hill Community Center. The clients' cooperation was good in all cases. We were introduced by the project workers, with whom the interviewees were very much at home, and this factor probably contributed to their willingness to answer questions.

The average age of the respondents was 52.8, compared with a higher mean age, 57.3 years, for the original group. This difference is probably attributable to the fact that with one exception those interviewed were women -- the average age for women in the original group was younger by more than three years than that of the males. It also indicates that the older group was not reached by the training program.

The educational level was higher for the interviewed group than for those initially contacted -- the mean level was 7.4 years as compared with a mean of 6.8 for both men and women in the larger sample. The average educational level for females was 7.6 years in the interviewed group; slightly higher than the 7.1 years of the original contacts. There was a wide variation in educational level: from two years of schooling (one) to one year of college (one).

	Original contacts	Interviewees
Mean age	57.3	52.8
Mean years of Education	6.8	7.4
Employment Status - Total		
Employed	77 (35.8%)	20 (62.5%)
Unemployed	138 (64.2%)	12 (37.5%)
Employment Status - females		
Employed	28 (21.4%)	20 (64.5%)
Unemployed	103 (78.6%)	11 (35.5%)

Although the income figures are not impeccable -- in some cases the clients were reluctant to disclose their incomes; we occasionally had difficulty in ascertaining the combined family income; and in other cases income was clearly understated -- there was obviously a wide range of income among the interviewees. One woman was earning over $100.00 a week, while others were receiving minimum social security or welfare checks.[8]

---

[8] Unfortunately, it is impossible to compare the income figures of the interviewees with those of the initial contacts, as the latter frequently reported an hourly wage with no indication of hours worked based on Project worker reports. Nor are there figures for amounts of Public Assistance or Social Security benefits. Furthermore, it would seem misleading to compare a group whose reported earnings come almost entirely from males with one which is 96.9% female. Nor is it possible to make statistical comparison of earnings and employment before and after training. As will become clear, no precise "before and after" distinction can be made.

Table 4. Educational level and employment status of interviewees in Project GROW.*

Years of Education	Number	Employment Status: Employed Number	Employed Percent	Unemp. or not in lab. force Number	Unemp. or not in lab. force Percent
1-4	7	2	28.6%	5	71.4%
5-8	13	9	69.2%	4	30.8%
9-12	11	8	72.7%	3	27.3%
over 12	1	1	100.0%	0	-
		20	62.5%	12	37.5%

* Includes thirty-one females and one male.

Source: interview data.

Table 5. Net weekly earnings* of employed individuals and combined family earnings of interviewees in Project GROW.

Weekly Earnings	Number of Individuals**	Combined Family Earnings***
Less than $25.00	5	2
$25.00 to $34.99	6	0
$35.00 to $49.99	6	1
$50.00 to $74.99	4	1
$75.00 to $99.99	0	7
$100.00 to $124.99	1	5
$125.00 and over	0	1

* Includes property income in a few cases.

** Individual respondents sometimes stated their own personal earnings but were reluctant or uncertain about family earnings.

*** Incomes are believed understated because of inaccurate estimates of hours worked and a reluctance to give full income information.

Source: interview data.

At the time of the interviews, twenty (62.5 per cent) of the thirty-two were employed, mostly as baby-sitters, cooks, waitresses, or cleaning women. This virtually reverses the employment figures for the larger group, only 35.8 per cent of whom were employed. Of the twenty who were employed, fourteen had begun their employment before the project began, and continued to be employed either with the same employer (in one case for twenty years) or in the same type of work. The project was instrumental in one form or another in assisting eight women with jobs (25 per cent of those interviewed), but two of these women were no longer working when they were interviewed (Table 6). The part actually played by the project in the employment of these eight people should be clarified:

1) Four women were given on-the-job training at the Alpine Court and Restaurant in Hot Springs, N. C. Of these four, two had worked there before and were promoted as a result of their training; another had worked there without pay to help her sister, who was supporting her, and was placed on the payroll after the training.

2) One woman, who had called the project and asked for work, was able with the project's help to find two short-term jobs as housekeeper and companion. These jobs have since terminated.

3) One woman, who received an income from her rooming house and farm, and had worked in a cafe before, was employed as a waitress by the husband of one of the project workers. She also attended the sewing class.

4) One woman attended the cooking class, and subsequently found work in a school as a cook, which was probably the result of her training. However, she does not plan to continue, since she feels the work is too difficult and she is getting too old.

5) One woman who attended the sewing class was employed by the project as a receptionist, but was released in the fall of 1966 when it was thought that the project was coming to a close. Since that time she has been unemployed.

Ten of the thirty-two interviewed were unemployed or not in the labor force. Since it is almost impossible to distinguish between those unemployed and those not in the labor force, these two groups are treated as one in this summary. Two persons were disabled; one felt her home responsibilities precluded her seeking a job; the remaining seven expressed an interest in working, but they attached so many conditions or were so restricted by factors such as the lack of transportation, that it would be misleading to conclude that they were actively looking for a job. Some of these people, the interviewers felt, replied that they were looking for a job and would accept one if offered because they thought this response was expected of them. Of the entire 32, only one had registered with the employment service. Various reasons were given for this, but the basic reasons seemed to be both a lack of confidence in this as a possibility, or a lack of real interest in finding a job.

Table 6. Relation of employment status and type of training provided persons in Project GROW.

Employment Status	Type of Training	Number	Number Job-related
Unemployed	Adult Education only	6	
	Ad.Ed. + Institutional Trng.	3	
	Institutional Training only	1*	
Employed pre-project	Adult Education only	None	
	Ad.Ed. + Institutional Trng.	5	1
	Institutional Training only	9	3
Employed Through project	Adult Education only	None	
	Institutional Training only	3	1
	On-the-job training only	3	
	Ad.Ed. + On-the-job trng.	1	
	Placement	1	
	Totals	32	5

* Income from husband's estate far above project maximum.

Source: interview data.

An examination of the types of training received by these people casts a light on the sorts of people reached by the project.

1) Of the fourteen already employed at the onset of the project, all fourteen took one or the other or both of the institutional training classes. Five attended an adult education class as well.

2) In only four instances was it conceivable that the institutional training courses could have been beneficial (or even related) to their jobs. (Three cooks attended cooking class, one woman who makes alterations at a cleaner's and dislikes her job, took the sewing course.)

3) Three of the eight employed through the project received some institutional training; in only one case was this training job-related.

4) Nine of the ten unemployed had taken adult education classes. The one who did not, did not in any way fall within the limits of the project. Her husband had died recently, and her income from assets held was far above the range specified by the project. She took both institutional training classes. Three of these also attended an institutional training course.

On-the-job training and job placement must both be considered very unsuccessful - the OJT so unsuccessful that as of September 1, 1966, no further contracts were sought.

> The Project was given a budget of $25,000 to train an estimated 50 clients in local establishments under OJT contracts. The Project Plan states that the average cost per trainee will be no more than $500 and the average cost per week for each trainee would be not more than $20. It also states that the contracts must be approved by a representative of the Department of Labor.
>
> After much persuasion the Employment of Job Developer and the Project Negotiator were able to write a limited number OJT contracts with employers in the area. This was not an easy task. The employer

> preferred the younger experienced worker and he was skeptical of getting mixed up in a government contract.
>
> A total of nine clients were placed on OJT contracts (twelve contracts were negotiated, but three were not placed). Two of these were placed during this report period. These two have been refused approval by the representative of the Department of Labor. The first seven OJT contracts were approved as a courtesy and according to present guidelines it will not be possible to negotiate further OJT contracts. The guidelines are made for an industrial area and do not fit the jobs or the clients in the target area of the Project.[9]

By September 1, 1966, four more placements had been made, but only two of the thirteen were still working. The explanation for failures to continue working are revealing:

> Two clients walked off the job -- one after one-half day. Five of them could not do the work and were dismissed. One client could not accept a reprimand from the foreman and quit. One client was dismissed for apparently no good

---

[9] Project GROW, Fifth Periodic Report, July 1, 1966-August 31, 1966, pp. 9-10.

> reason. Employer said his work was satisfactory, but someone else had made an offer for the job...One client became intoxicated and was put in jail. After his release he disappeared, although his employer would have taken him back.[10]

In reporting on some of the earlier interviews, the employment counselor noted that the older rural person's concept of wages, of what is expected of a worker, or what he must do to become a wage earner, presented a great barrier to employment.

> The vast majority of these clients have been isolated from virtually all contact with all but their own small communities, coves, or creeks except for an occasional visit to the county seat, Marshall, a rural town of 926. Not many of them come into close contact with anyone who is gainfully employed on a fulltime basis...[11]

Again it is clear that the expectation of job training and placement without some preliminary attention to preparation for work was an unrealistic one. It may be that even if administrative problems had

---

[10] Ibid., p. 11.

[11] Project GROW, Fourth Periodic Report, May 1, 1966-June 30, 1966, pp. 12-13.

had not delayed job training, an actual training program would have faced serious difficulties because of the factors cited by the employment counselor.

The problem was not entirely that of the clients, however. There are a very limited number of job opportunities in the area. Within Madison County there are only three firms of any size and one of these, an electronics plant, requires highly skilled employees. The other two employ semi-skilled workers associated with textile mill operations; most of these jobs can be learned on the job, but the learning period is sometimes an extended one. One of the textile firms objected to hiring Project GROW clients because they had been trained on manual sewing machines, while the firm used electric models. A tomato-packing firm provided some jobs, but only of temporary nature. Another textile firm closed down shortly after a few placements were made.

Most of the clients seemed to accept with equanimity the fact that the area offered so few possibilities for employment.

2. Counseling

The figures on counseling and referrals to other agencies are difficult to summarize. When the project was initiated, offices were located in Marshall, North Carolina, and in that rural area the counselors interviewed more than 200 men and women in preparation for job training. But due to delays in getting training underway, the project did not follow up most of these persons; eventually, project headquarters were moved to Asheville.

It is evident that older persons in the area needed guidance in order to find existing sources of support. The usual problems of communication are magnified in rural mountain sections, where transportation is poor, educational levels extremely low, and general knowledge of community facilities practically non-existent. Some examples of the services provided in the course of interviewing and counseling are:

> Referral to United Social Services for temporary financial help (subsequently, counselor got the family a food basket from local church); Referrals to United Social Service for marital counsel;
>
> Arrangements for 79 persons to be fitted with glasses;[12] twelve of these had to have further treatment for eye trouble;
>
> Advice on how to establish official birth date;
>
> Transportation to and from physicians;

---

[12] Any Buncombe County resident obtained his glasses for $1.00, the remainder of the fee being paid by the Lion's Club and the North Carolina Commission for the Blind. Madison County residents were charged $11.00 each; these fees were paid in sums of one, two, or three dollars at a time.

Help in securing Social Security numbers;

Encouragement to attend basic education classes.

Some examples of the kinds of advice-service roles played by the counselors illustrate the complex nature of the job. A woman enrolled in a basic education course was in desperate need of food and clothing, but did not know where to turn for help. The counselor contacted the welfare agency, then transported the woman back and forth until she was taken over by that agency. Another woman with invalid parents wanted to learn a home craft that would supplement her low income. She was given transportation to the workshop of a man skilled in making chair bottoms, where a training class of one was launched. A woman had borrowed money to pay her husband's hospital bill without knowing that there were public funds for hardship cases. After many trips and phone calls by the counselor, the woman was reimbursed.

Employment counseling of sorts was also offered. This was one of the least successful aspects of the project. One group interested in a potential training class in sewing received group counseling and was given a test battery. The IPAT Cultural Fair Tests were given in conjunction with parts 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of the General Aptitude Test Battery. On the whole, the group had difficulty following directions. The general functional educational level was low; scores and test record cards are on file. Several persons were given the Orthro-Rater Test and the Gray Oral Reading Test. An interview with each person followed the testing.

More recently, the employment counselor conferred with members of the Basic Education Division, Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute, regarding the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Advanced Battery, that was scheduled to be given to potential trainees. In the counselor's opinion, the Advanced Battery was far above the general functional level of the group to be tested.

> He felt that the client group would do very poorly and become so discouraged about the test that they would loose all interest in the Project. He was supported in his opinion by ...(the) Madison County School Superintendent. An agreement was reached that the Intermediate Battery would also be given. The Counselor prepared two lists to show the clients below and above the 4.0 level as determined by the Gray Oral Reading Test in order that the two different test batteries could be administered. All of this was to no avail and the Advanced Battery was attempted and failed.[13]

E. EVALUATION

The plan for Project GROW, called for the cooperation of three local groups: Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute to provide teachers for institutional training classes; Project GROW officials to recruit the rural older workers and provide the transportation which would enable them to attend these classes; and the Employment Security Commission to help place the people once they had been trained, or alternatively, to arrange on-the-job training. This arrangement only partly materialized, and then only after many delays.

---

[13] Project GROW, Fourth Periodic Report, May 1, 1966-June 30, 1966, pp. 12-13.

The long process of initiating a program for counseling and training older workers in the Asheville area began in the National Council on the Aging at least a year before the contract actually was drawn up. Between the time the contract was signed and the beginning of institutional training, another eighteen months elapsed. The two-and-a-half years of effort on the part of a number of people -- initially, staff and board members of NCOA, plus representatives of OMAT, joined later by members of the Buncombe County Committee on Aging, various employees of the state government, andthe staff of Project GROW -- indicates the extent of our awareness of the problem confronting older inrural workers. The status of the training phase of the project indicates our limited ability to find solutions.

Within the complicated network of federal, state, and local agencies, an attempt was made by (1) a local committee, advised by (2) a national voluntary association, to serve the employment needs of a particularly low-income group, using (3) federal funds which either (4) came through state agencies, or required some form of approval at the state level in order to be utilized. Thus, in addition to the local committees and agencies involved, the project operated in conjunction with the Employment Security Commission, the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training, and the state's Division of Community Colleges. There were delays in getting approval and the necessary support from these agencies, and there were further delays in funding by OMAT.

The scheduling of activities of the project was repeatedly halted because of these delays; recruitment of persons for counseling and training was started and then stopped more than once during the project. Understandably, the postponements were demoralizing to the older persons who thought they were being recruited for job training. Initially, the contract was signed but the local Committee had to borrow money in order to start the project, as no funds were immediately forthcoming. Later, funds for basic education were exhausted and these courses were delayed. Once institutional training began in two small classes, the contract period was almost over and it looked as if administrative funds for completing the program would not be available.

Institutional training in cooking and sewing was finally launched when the local school superintendent furnished the materials to be used, Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute agreed to provide the training,[14] and OMPER extended the project's contract covering the administrative costs of the program. However, complete cooperation never did result.

---

[14] All the classes provided by the Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute were open to anyone, and frequently Project GROW clients made up only a percentage of the students. The only difference between them (other than age) seems to have been that Project GROW provided transportation for their clients (an aid of no little value, however).

In the first place, the target group itself was the subject of some disagreement.[15] The original plan of the Buncombe County Committee on Aging and the Employment Security Commission called for retraining the elderly in the Asheville-Buncombe County area only. The Committee believed that they were the people who would be capable of absorbing training, and who could probably find employment once the training was completed. Employment Security officials believed that outside Buncombe County there were too few jobs in which trainees could be placed, and that the lack of transportation would be a severe hinderance. Moreover, they did not believe that residents of Madison County would be willing to leave their homes to find jobs. The Committee and the Employment Security Commission wanted to direct their efforts toward helping those persons who would benefit from the training (i.e., those who would be able to find employment) while they were young enough to be helped; they did not feel they should waste their resources on what they considered a lost cause.

These views were shared by officials of Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute,[16] who thought that the lack of transportation and the lack of industrial discipline meant that trainees would not be able to work in the Asheville area. As there were so few job opportunities in Madison County, it would be best to provide the unemployment in that area with skills they could utilize at home, such as crafts. There was the additional diffuculty of conducting classes for students on quite different levels -- those who had just finished school, and those who had been out for some time. They believed the older student, unable to keep up, would tend to become discouraged and drop out. The Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute official suggested the possibility of setting up a cooperative, pointing out that such efforts had been successful in the past.[17]

---

[15] The ensuing account is based on interviews with officials at the Employment Security Commission and Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute.

[16] Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute serves a ten county area, and is obligated to provide teachers for any course (not solely technical education) with an enrollment of 12-15 students, of any age.

However, the head of Project GROW at this time (the second of three directors) disagreed with the officials of both the Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute and the Employment Security Commission. Her idea was to go into the mountains -- the more remote the area, the better -- to recruit people for retraining, since these were obviously the people who needed help most. Although Employment Security officials stated their preference for focusing attention on the area which was accessible to Asheville, the director of Project GROW nevertheless structured the program in accordance with her ideas of where the greatest need lay. This basic conflict over the direction of the project apparently became very strong, and greatly hindered cooperation between the Employment Security Commission and Project GROW officials. According to Employment Security officials, the director of Project GROW, afraid that money would be used along the lines proposed by the Employment Security Commission, attempted to keep any project funds from being transferred through Employment Security. This seems to have eliminated any chance which might have remained for cooperation between the two agencies. Personal animosities developed, and once Project GROW began to concentrate on the more isolated, rural persons, the Employment Security Commission offered little help in making placements. The position of the Employment Security Commission was that their efforts would surely fail, since the clients would be able to reach the Asheville area to accept employment or on-the-job training, even if jobs were made available.

---

[17] The suggestion was first, to offer instruction at some central point; then the trainees would either continue working there, or work at home and have a co-op truck deliver materials and pick up the finished product. The ABT official believed that there was a demand for crafts sufficient to provide an income for the workers. He pointed out that the market is presently flooded with souvenirs and such articles that have been made in Japan.

There is little doubt that the Employment Security officials were correct in their assessment of the employment possibilities. There are very few job opportunities in Madison County, and the client's lack of transportation restricts their ability to seek these local jobs, to say nothing of those in the Asheville area. Many of the older persons live miles from any town. It seems unrealistic to expect the elderly to leave their homes to find work after retraining, although many would be glad to learn skills which could be practiced in their homes or in the area. Several people suggested that they would be interested in learning some sort of craft; and the idea of a home nursing course was very popular.

Nonetheless, the viewpoint of the second project director was considerably closer to that set out in the contract, which states that the project was to be directed at the "training and vocational adjustment of the geographically isolated older rural worker," with job opportunities to be obtained or created in a dominantly rural community. While the objections raised by the Employment Security Commission and the officials of Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute appear valid, the differences should have been resolved before the contract was drawn up. Why did they first agree, and then in effect refuse to service the contract?

There was also a great lack of understanding of the type of education needed. Among those persons interviewed, there was a definite correlation between education and employment. With the one exception already noted, most of the unemployed were in need of basic education before they were capable of absorbing any further training. Whether or not they went on for additional training, those who took the basic education courses were extremely enthusiastic.

Although a necessary preliminary to any job training, basic education is not itself job oriented, and cannot be evaluated on the same basis as job training. The enthusiasm of the students was unanimous; self-satisfaction was stressed as the primary reasons for taking the course. Many were learning to read and write adequately for the first time.

Even the sewing and cooking courses were not job-oriented. Those who received the institutional training were among those who needed it least, in terms of job training; hence, the training seldom benefitted those for whom it was originally intended: the unemployed. The women who took these classes were usually already employed. They enrolled in the courses for the personal satisfaction afforded and for the social purpose of getting together.

A third factor which contributed to the delay in getting the program started was the practice of hiring professional social workers to do the recruiting. They were apparently met with suspicion and failed to gain the confidence and interest of the prospective clients. When local workers who already knew many of the people in the surrounding area were hired, progress in recruiting improved.

The project cannot be considered a success in terms of job training and placement. Considering the obstacles in the way of jobs, however, it is clear that the program was able to accomplish a great deal in other areas. The necessity of providing supportive personal counseling is obvious. In many cases, such help may do far more to stimulate job preparation and actual job seeking than job training as such; in any case it is a necessary preliminary for training of the rural older worker. Perhaps the major shortcoming of this contract was its emphasis on job training, with inadequate attention to the problems needing attention before training could take place. Had this first attempt been directed altogether toward preparation for work (other than farming), resources might have been more effectively utilized.

F. CONCLUSIONS

What has been learned from this project that should be taken into account in the planning of future programs of this nature?

1) First and foremost adult education classes are desperately needed before any institutional training of the unemployed can be attempted. Even if no such training is contemplated, basic education alone would be of great value to the rural elderly. Many of these people would take as many courses as were offered.

2) There is clearly a need to consider further the thorny question of motivation. Many who were unemployed did not sound eager to find jobs, although they might have taken one had conditions been favorable. (And it should be noted that this was the group which was sufficiently motivated to attend classes in the 1st place) Perhaps the aspiration level of the younger persons in the area is higher. It is interesting to note that although data from other sources indicate extremely low levels of education attainment even among the young, of the thirteen families interviewed having children under age eighteen, there were only two instances in which the children had quit school. Continuation in school seems typical, then, even among the children of these poor ill-educated families.

3) One possible solution might be to teach skills that can be used without requiring the worker to leave home. The isolation of many of those interviewed would virtually prohibit them from finding a job, even if they were sufficiently trained. There appears to be little desire or even willingness to move.

4) It is unrealistic to train the workers without giving any thought to the question of the potential employers. Finding jobs for the older persons with the characteristics described above, difficult enough under any circumstances, is particularly hard in an area offering so few alternatives. Unless the elderly are trained to work independently or moved out of Appalachia, they will have jobs only if new industry comes into the area.

5) Although some of the interviewees were extremely poor, in many cases those who received the benefits of the program were not. They were neither hard-core unemployed nor in immediate need of financial assistance. Perhaps one way to attract the very poor would be to pay them a certain amount per week for attending the classes; however, many of the poorer clients stated that they expected no money and felt that the learning itself was payment enough.

In concluding, several questions of a more general nature should also be raised. One has to do with method -- specifically, with the order in which community problems of this sort might best be approached. The order followed here was clearly not successful. A national voluntary agency interested in the welfare of all older people conferred with local citizens interested in the welfare of their own older population. After much effort, the local committee convinced MDTA that they could perform a needed service, and a contract was agreed to. But either the terms of the agreement were poorly drawn or poorly understood; or some parties to the agreement were not fully informed and interested. As a result, although the project was not entirely without success, the amount of effort that was poured into it could have been much more productive.

Would it not be possible to avoid some of the pitfalls inherent in community-initiated, state-approved, and federally-financed programs by providing some initial guidelines to the community? Certain fundamental questions could be raised as a matter of course, and perhaps a small planning grant made for the purpose of setting the problem forth. For example, a careful scrutiny of the educational levels and job histories of a few of the rural older workers in Buncombe and Madison Counties would have led to a much more tightly written proposal. Basic education -- one of the biggest hold-ups in the program -- would have been placed center-stage, with counseling and job preparation probably constituting the remainder of the project.

A second question related to the long-run aspects of income maintenance, and its relation to employability. The variables affecting employability are not only the usual ones -- age, education, job history. There are important variations also in attitudes toward working, in aspirations, in expectations (based on one's past experience), in one's perception of how the community feels about the worker and the non-worker. The chances of rendering employable the older persons in this locale may be affected as much by the latter, harder-to-measure factors as by the ones traditionally cited. Psychologist Norman Chansky has suggested that in this region attitudes, both of the unemployed and of the community toward the unemployed, are much more tolerant than are views elsewhere in the state. If such attitudes do exist here and are in any measure typical of Appalachia, some account must be taken of the fact. In any case, some further probing of the question would be helpful. Of the thousands of welfare recipients in the isolated areas of West Virginia, Kentucky, and North Carolina, for whom meagre income maintenance has provided subsistence for years, how many are trainable and employable?

Finally, some comment on the remarkable persistence and patience of the Committee, the composition of which changed very little during the entire period, is irresistable. Despite full time commitments to other jobs, these people continued to work unbelievably long hours in keeping the project alive. From the early days of the project, when there was no money and the Committee borrowed from the local bank to meet expenses (they owned the building that housed project headquarters, so it was reasonable that it lend the project enough to pay its rent), to its completion, ingenuity and perspective have been evident. Perhaps the most notable feature of the program has been the capacity of the staff to meet the older person's need in whatever context it appeared: lack of transportation, eye glasses, social security numbers or birth certificates, food. It is difficult to attach any quantitative significance to such services, except in terms of numbers of persons counseled, trained, etc. But the merit of the program rests primarily on these services, rather than on the job training provided.

An experimental program is expected to demonstrate what cannot (as well as what can) be accomplished in a given set of circumstances. Using this criterion, the Project seems to point up the enormous difficulties involved in providing job training to this particular group through a community-initiated effort. It indicates, too, the need for services other than training. There may be some implications for broader programs dealing with human resource development in this area. With respect to the success of this single effort, one can only conclude that important counseling and related services were provided, despite unusually adverse conditions. With better planning in the future, however, such services could be offered at less cost in time and effort.

THE OLDER WORKER PROJECT IN MILWAUKEE

by

Richard Perlman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

A. EVALUATION OF THE OLDER WORKER PROJECT 166

B. EVALUATION OF THE INTERVIEW DATA 174

Though the initial purpose of this study involved only the evaluation of the scope and effectiveness of the Milwaukee Older-Worker Project, conducted from June 1964 to June 1965, the wealth of interview data collected permits additional findings that may be of value in continuing efforts to expand employment opportunities of older workers. Accordingly, besides a more or less formal evaluation of the Milwaukee project itself, this report contains an analysis of the questionnaire responses.

On the basis of this analysis, recommendations will be made suggesting steps that could be undertaken to strengthen the chances for employment of older, marginal, workers. Thus, the report is in two parts, the first consisting of the evaluation of the Milwaukee project, and the second the analysis of the interview data.

A. EVALUATION OF THE OLDER WORKER PROJECT

Background of the Milwaukee Study: Originally the project, which was budgeted at $15,000, had the five following goals, as contained in the contract between OMAT and the Milwaukee Council on the Aging, the organization administering the project:

1. Testing, recommending for training, counseling, and placement of 200 older workers (over 50 years of age), unskilled and of limited education, who were unemployed as of June 1964 because of plant closings or relocation.--(No reason was given for the last condition, but the presumption must be that NCOA services were to be

limited to those workers who were displaced not because of any inability to perform the jobs they held.)

2. Stimulating community involvement in the employment problems of older workers.--As a by-product of the project, community and business leaders who would serve on the council board would be induced to carry on their interest in fully utilizing existing facilities for the job placement of older workers.

3. Inducing firms to tailor jobs for the specific needs of older workers, not only for the project, but for future application as well.

4. Cooperating with vocational training programs, whether public or on-the-job plans of individual companies, for intensive training of a sample of 50 of the 200 clients to fit clients to jobs most suited to their capacities and to modify job requirements to match their (developed) aptitudes.--Further, these 50 clients would be counseled, and encouraged to continue, both through the training period and after job placement.

5. Testing for aptitude and motivation of all 200 clients.--On the basis of these tests clients would either be recommended for specific training programs with a view towards labor job placement, or considered currently unemployable for industry and not recommended for training (or retraining). (Goal 1.) Further, these tests and study of responses of the 200 clients would serve as the basis for the establishment of a standard test that could be used in the

future to be applied to older workers. A refined test based on the Milwaukee experiment could then serve as the basis for a general test to measure motivation and aptitude of older workers in general. This test could then serve as a guide to training and placement specialists.

Thus Goal 1. differs from 5. in that the former deals with the practical problem of reemploying the study group while the latter aims to conduct psychological research on the test group to permit generalization to proper methods for testing motivation and aptitude for older workers.

Review of Accomplishments: From the vantage point of hindsight, it can be concluded that the goals were to ambitious for the limitations of time and money.

Considering time first, the goals dictated a sequential procedure. Before Goals 2, 3, and 4 could be approached, it would be necessary that Goals 1 and 5 be satisfied. That is, in accordance with the Project's prevailing philosophy of gaining greater insight into the special problems and capabilities of older unemployed workers as a preliminary to action towards reemploying them, it was necessary to test, measure, and study the workers before community, industry, and training facilities could be fully mobilized to direct their activities into the channels determined by prior testing. Psychological testing takes time, and one year was too short a period in which the results and recommendations of the testing could be translated into action. As a matter of fact, the Project only attempted to achieve the first and last goals.

As for monetary limitations, since basic psychological study was attempted, $15,000 was just too little to do more than pay the (part-time) project director's salary of $5,000, and cover initial psychological studies of the individual clients. Thus, even the last goal could not be fully achieved. Since a test design had to be developed on the basis of the sample studied, while the results of individual case studies are plentiful and probably useful as the basis for further generalization, at least in the opinion of the evaluation consultant psychologist, there was neither time nor money to consolidate the data into a meaningful instrument for future use.

Before reviewing the psychological testing aspect of the Project, which was in reality its chief, if not exclusive, undertaking, mention should be made of the internal debate over Project procedures. Initially, a Project Committee was established to plan, review and help administer the Project's progress towards the attainment of its goals. In keeping with the goals of action and community involvement, this Committee consisted of the head of the Milwaukee Council on the Aging, later to be Project Director, the head of the local branch of the Wisconsin State Employment Service, the head of the Milwaukee Vocational School, President of a local bank, who served as Treasurer, and a county medical official. The Committee was divided over the central issue of whether the Project should be geared to immediate action or study. Eventually, the study view, championed by the Council head, won out. The other Committee members either resigned or lost interest, and the Project began its course of psychological study and recommendation for training (Goal 1.), which it was to follow throughout its life.

Looking back, with all the advantages of hindsight, it can be concluded that the dispute was really one of conflicting goals rather than of personalities. Given the time and money limitations noted above, the Project could either attempt to study the older unemployed workers, not with the primary aim of reemploying them, but of analyzing their characteristics, problems, and potentialities for the purpose of serving as a guide for training and job-tailoring for the older unemployed in general, or it could take the limited and short-run view of exerting its energies to the specific task of reemploying older Milwaukee unemployed workers. It could not attain both broad goals simultaneously, and the conflict was over which path to follow. One might question the advisability of having a small local project undertake the broad goal of generalizing the employment problems of older workers, but the original Milwaukee Project statement of goals allowed for this activity, and in any case it was the path followed.

Psychological Testing: In all 122 clients were interviewed and tested by the Project Consulting Psychologist and his staff. These comprised the total of unemployed workers over 50 years old, as of

June 1, 1964, on the Milwaukee Employment Service rolls, who fit the criterion of displacement because of plant shut-down or relocation.

On the basis of the psychological team's appraisal, 56 were recommended for training among three programs conducted by the Milwaukee Vocational School--small appliance repair, building maintenance, and janitorial services. These referrals had no better training program drop-out rate nor more successful job placement record than the average for older workers in general, according to statements by Employment Service and Vocational School representatives. But before these results are considered only as testimony to the ineffectiveness of the psychological approach to the problem of improving the employment prospects of older workers, two explanatory factors should be noted.

First, liaison between the Project and existing training facilities was not very close after the breakup of the Project Committee. Further adding to the difficulty of placing men in training programs in compliance with the psychologists' recommendation was the Vocational School's practice, determined by financial need, of enrolling workers in training programs in accordance with the timing of the availability of MDTA funds. For some clients this meant placement in training programs before, and after at variance with, psychologists' recommendation.

Second, and more fundamental, the psychological team worked under the premise that their principal work was the development of a test instrument for the measurement of attitudes, aptitudes, and motivation of older workers, and not the practical procedure of using existing methods to recommend workers for training for specific jobs. Thus, since the clients were treated more as case studies for research rather than as individuals with employment problems, recommendations for their placement were of secondary interest to the psychological group, perhaps explaining the spotty record of achievement in this area.

The clients were not misled into believing that they would be helped in finding jobs by undergoing psychological study and testing. Perhaps this separation of Project activity from individual worker goal, of finding work, explains why so few of the clients reported any benefits from participating in the program. In truth, the program, or at least its actual procedure, was not specifically designed to aid them as individuals.

In the individual psychological examinations, the formal structured questionnaire approach was not used. In fairness to the psychological goal of the project though, it could be argued that a formal test instrument would be the ultimate result of the probing, unstructured, non-quantifiable individual analyses conducted.

But the project never proceeded beyond the probing stage. The Project Consulting Psychologist claimed that the limitation of time and money prevented completion of the work to the point of the formulation of standard tests. It was the opinion of the Evaluation Study Consulting Psychologist that much more time and effort would be needed before a meaningful instrument for measuring the aptitudes and motivation of older workers could be devised from the data collected, and that the information gathered was not sufficiently complete to allow for the development of such an instrument. As a result the Wisconsin State Employment Service continues to test older workers with the General Aptitude Test Battery, as it does all unemployed clients regardless of age.

SUMMARY

The Milwaukee Project, after an initial period of indecision over which goals to follow, settled into a pattern of a study project rather than an action program to reemploy older displaced workers. Time and money available did not permit definite organized conclusions to the study. The study had as its goal to obtain through psychological testing and examination of the individual clients the establishment of a replacement for the General Aptitude Test Battery to be used for job placement and/or training of older workers. The data from the psychological interviews are plentiful, and still available, but require much more work before they can be used as a source for establishment of standardized tests to aid in the placement of future unemployed older workers.

As would be expected, considering the nature and purpose of the project, interviews of the clients during the Evaluation Study yielded no information on the effectiveness or value of the Milwaukee Project. Nevertheless the interview data collected provide a useful source of information on the characteristics of the older unemployed in the area and the relationship between training, placement, and job opportunities for these older workers.

B. EVALUATION OF THE INTERVIEW DATA*

Introduction: All interviews were conducted by Mrs. Doris Lincoln, a graduate student in Social Work at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. These interviews were conducted during the period May-October 1966. An attempt was made to interview all 122 clients studied by the psychological group. Of these, complete interviews were held with 70. The remainder could not be reached or refused to be questioned, with 15 in the latter group.

In addition, interviews were conducted with a control group of 20 unemployed workers who did not participate in the project, that is, who were not studied by the psychological group. These were workers over 50 years of age, available for interviewing, from a list of 46 unemployed as of June 1, 1964, not included in the project client list since they were not unemployed because of plant shutdown or relocation.

Thus, since the project clients received only psychological questioning and testing, and not counseling and guidance, the only two differences between the client and control groups were that in some cases the former we e recommended for particular training programs, and that among the control group were some who lost their jobs becauee of inability to perform assigned work. Despite these differences, the characteristics of both groups were generally similar.

---

* There is no analysis of employer attitudes. All employers were unaware that any older workers they hired had gone through a special program. Those employers interviewed reported that the performance of the client group was indistinguishable from that of older workers in general. These findings are not surprising, considering the limited nature of the Milwaukee Project.

The rest of this Report studies both groups, on the basis of the interview data,[*] with a view to finding the elements associated with age and employment problems and to studying the effectiveness of measures designed to reduce these problems.

1. Personal and Family Characteristics

Table 1 presents the data collected on personal and family background of the workers interviewed. The data contain few surprises, following the general trend for older, and/or unemployed workers.

Table 1.

Personal and Family Characteristics

Sex			Race			Marital Status			Family Size		
Male	62 (14)	86% (70%)	White	47, (15)	65% (75%)	Married	42 (8)	58% (40%)	One	15 (6)	21% (30%)
Female	9 (6)	12% (30%)	Negro	19 (5)	26% (25%)	Single	10 (1)	14% (5%)	Two	28 (5)	39% (25%)
N.A.	1	1%	Other	1	1%	Widow	4 (2)	6% (10%)	Three	18 (4)	25% (20%)
			N.A.	5	7%	Divorced	6 (7)	8% (35%)	Four	5 (4)	7% (20%)
						Separated	10 (2)	14% (1%)	Five	2 (1)	3% (5%)
									Six or more	4	5%

---

[*] Throughout, figures in parentheses represent control group data.

A high percentage of males appears in both groups. This merely reflects the tendency for older women to leave the labor force rather than continue on unemployment rolls.

The Negro proportion of about 25% in both client and control groups is more than double the Negro population or labor force percentage in the area, but is only slightly above the national and area ratio of racial unemployment composition.

At first view, considering the age of the respondents, it might appear that an unusually large number are married, with living spouses, and with other household members. But it should be noted that most subjects were males, less likely to have deceased spouses than females.

Two important personal characteristics for which data were gathered, but for which a detailed breakdown is not available, are age and educational attainment. All workers were over 50, but the mean age was a comparatively young 54 years. We are dealing, in the main, with workers relatively far removed from the standard retirement age, that is, for whom age has not yet loosened their ties to the labor force. Thus the need for these workers is not for some stopgap marginal job, but work that promises almost as much employment stability as that required by the average worker.

The client group averaged about 9 years of schooling, slightly higher than their (typically female) spouses. This is about what would be expected from an older, mainly unskilled, group.

2. Financial Resources

The financial burdens of unemployment can only be lightened by outside financial resources to substitute for loss of employment income. As might be expected, the group of unemployed older workers in both the client and control population, of relatively little training and education, of a past history of low earning power, had little recourse to personal and other private sources of funds to help tide them over their period of unemployment.

In the period since their last employment, 21 of the client group and only 2 of the control group supported themselves from past savings. Five and (1) relied on earnings of other family members. Four and (1) supported themselves from loans **and six** and (4) from non-labor income. Thus, 36 or exactly 50% of the client group and (8) or (40%) of the control group depended on private sources of financial assistance. Data are not available on the extent of their support, but the amount of this type of support was probably not substantial.

As for public assistance and unemployment insurance, 20 or 29% of the client group and (8) or (40%) of the control group received welfare aid, averaging about $25 per week for both groups. Of the client group 24 or 1/3 received unemployment insurance, averaging about $30 weekly. Most of the other clients were not eligible for this unemployment insurance.

In general, it can be concluded that financial resources were not adequate to sustain these workers during long periods of unemployment, without recourse to minimal welfare support.

3. Recent Employment History

The interview data permit close study of important characteristics of the recent work experience of these older workers. In general, as Table 2 reveals, they were more prone to unemployment than the average, had a much higher job turnover, and earned relatively low wages.

Table 2.

Recent Employment History

Current Employment Status			Jobs since 1961			Hours per Week			Hourly Wages		
Employed	49	68%	Zero	4	6%	0-10	1	2%	0-$1	31	70%
	(14)	(70%)		(1)	(5%)					(8)	(67%)
Unemployed	11	15%	1	17	24%	20-30	3	6%	$1-$2	13	30%
	(2)	(10%)		(2)	(10%)		(4)	(28%)		(4)	(33%)
Not in labor force	11	15%	2	22	30%	30-40	1	20%			
	(4)	(20%)		(6)	(30%)		(1)	(7%)			
N.A.	1	1%	3	17	24%	40-50	36	73%			
				(5)	(25%)		(7)	(50%)			
			4	7	10%	Over 50	4	8%			
				(4)	(20%)		(2)	(14%)			
			Over 4	5	7%	N.A.	4	8%			
				(2)	(10%)						

The very strong labor market in the area is reflected in the relatively great number of those who were out of work in 1964 who were working at the time of the interviews, in 1966. At the same time, though, it should be noted that at 15%, the unemployment rate for the client group was five times the area rate.

There was also a tendency for those who could not find jobs to "retire" from the labor force. Considering that they were only in their early 50's, this move was probably based more on lack of job opportunities than on a sincere wish to quit working.

The average American worker holds about six jobs during his lifetime. These workers averaged about three over a five-year period. This rapid turnover reflects the tenuous hold of the unskilled marginal worker on any particular job.

Hours worked, as reported, were surprisingly high. The vast majority of the 49 employed held full-time jobs. Noting that there was no check on the accuracy of responses, perhaps the large number in the 40-50 hour group might have exaggerated actual work hours.

A finer breakdown of hourly wages is not available, yet the broad data collected on those who responded testify to the low wages of the group.

An important aspect of employment is the worker's attitude toward his job. His degree of job satisfaction will partially determine his effectiveness on the job as well as his attachment to it and tendency to hold on to it.

In Table 3, certain features of job attitude are presented.

Table 3.

Employment Attitudes

	Client Group		Control Group	
Source of Job				
Friends and relatives	37	75%	(9)	(64%)
Public Employment Service . .	11	22%	(4)	(28%)
Other	1	2%	(1)	(7%)
Reasons for Taking Job				
Only one available.	33	67%	(8)	(57%)
Result of training	1	2%		
N. A.	15	30%	(6)	(43%)
Job Satisfaction				
Satisfied	25	51%	(4)	(28%)
Dissatisfied	13	26%	(9)	(64%)
Uncertain	11	22%	(1)	(7%)
Advancement Expectation				
No advancement hopes.	29	59%	(12)	(86%)
Expect advancement	11	27%		
Uncertain	9	18%	(2)	(14%)

The reasons for holding one job instead of another are bound to affect the worker's attitude toward his work. Job search for both groups was not conducted in a systematic way, using all available agencies facilitating search and then weighing alternatives. For both groups, most found their jobs through informal information on openings provided by friends, relatives, neighbors, etc. The public Employment Service was also a source of jobs, but syptomatic of the limited efforts of job search expended by workers without much training in the low-paid job market, newspapers and private agencies were not used.

Answers to the reasons for holding their current job rather than another reflect the haphazard manner of job selection. Most responded that their current job was the first one that was available after a period of unemployment, or that it was the only job they could find. Given their limited efforts at job search, these two responses simply represent two forms of the same answer.

(That only 1 worker thought he does his current type of work as a resulting of training bears no significance to the importance of training. This question dealt with the mechanism of placement and not on the technical requirements of the job held. The Employment Serivce uses training records in placing workers, and certainly no matter what the manner of referral, training and experience were important considerations in the employer's decision to offer workers jobs.)

The question on job satisfaction was purposely general to elicit responses as to overall impressions rather than to specific reasons for attitudes. There was a significant difference between the responses of the client and control groups, with the proportion of satisfied about

2 to 1 for the former group and 1 to 2 for the latter. Could it be that despite the casual method of selecting (finding) jobs by both groups, those who were unemployed in 1964 because of elements beyond their control--plant shutdown or relocation--were on average better trained or more productive and thus able to find more satisfactory positions later on?

The data on advancement expectation support the responses to the job satisfaction question. Despite their age, over 20% of the client group expect to advance on their present jobs. None of the control group had any hope for promotion.

For both groups there was a positive relationship between wage and job satisfaction. Thus there was a tendency for the workers to be more satisfied with their jobs the higher their wages. This finding supports the responses to a question on what was most important aspect of a job on which the leading response was financial security.

The above discussion deals only with the work experience of the respondents at the time of the interviews. All were unemployed in June 1964, but many held jobs after that period, other than their present ones or current state of unemployment. The following material relates to the work experience of both groups since 1961, excluding their current status.

Table 4 summarizes recent work activity of both groups. The data represent composite responses for the period 1961-1966.

Table 4.

Labor Force Activity, 1961-1966

Activity before Current Status:	Client Group		Control Group	
Working	29	40%	(10)	(50%)
Unemployed	10	14%	(4)	(20%)
Retired	22	31%	(4)	(20%)
Not in labor force	2	3%		
N.A.	9	12%	(2)	(10%)
Reason for leaving last job:				
Job ended and/or company moved	22	76%	(9)	(90%)
Laid off	1	3%		
Didn't like work	6	20%	(1)	(10%)
Reasons for long periods of unemployment:				
Health or handicap	16	22%	(5)	(25%)
No job in area	12	17%		
No job in field	6	8%		
Discrimination (Race or Age)	9	13%	(10)	(50%)
Lack of skills, training or education	5	7%	(2)	(10%)
Other	3	4%		
No Response	21	28%	(3)	(15%)

The comparatively large number who considered themselves "retired" when out of work is very interesting. Here we have supporting evidence that older workers comprise an important element in "hidden unemployment," those workers not in the labor force when jobs are hard to find, but who would be willing to work were jobs available. Thus, under tight labor market conditions, as prevailed in Milwaukee during the period of the study, the tendency would be greater for older workers to seek jobs, and finding jobs for them more important.

Responses to the question on reasons for loss of jobs were not too numerous. But almost all the respondents from both groups thought they lost their jobs through factors affecting the company rather than from any shortcomings in their own work performance.

Interesting differences appear in the reasons the two groups gave for long periods of unemployment. While both groups gave major importance to health as a factor, the client group thought lack of job opportunities--with area being more important than particular occupational or industrial field--equally important, but the control group weighted discrimination as by far the heaviest element in their out-of-work condition. This view certainly affects their attitude towards their chances of finding work, and might also negatively affect their efforts to improve their employability. Perhaps the control group actually did suffer more from discrimination than the client group, but it should be recalled that the clients all were unemployed in 1964 because of plant shutdown or movement out of the area, while the control group was not so satisfied that they were out of work for reasons beyond their control. The implication here is that the client group might, on balance, have contained more capable workers.

Since health was an important consideration in unemployment for both groups, data on the relationship between health and employability warrants attention. Forty-four (61%) of the client group and 17 (85%) of the control group reported that health problems prevented them from working at some time during the period 1961-1966. Indications are that the health problems were real rather than imaginary reasons for explaining inability to find work. Of the 12 members of the client group who reported that health problems now prevented them from working, 10 said that physicians advised them not to work; for the control group 5 out of 7 so reported.

4. Training and Employment

Apart from special efforts by industry to tailor jobs for older workers, and improvements in the mechanism of job search and placement, the greatest hope for improving employment opportunities of older workers lies in training and retraining them for today's industrial labor needs. For the group under study this training would have to be financed and provided publicly. In the first place, almost none of these older workers have the financial resources to provide for their own training. Secondly, even if they did, investment in training yields poor returns to workers who have only a comparatively few years to take advantage of the skills they acquire.

Besides financial support, public agencies can facilitate training by actively recruiting potential trainees, by channeling workers to training courses best suited to their background of experience and their aptitudes--as was attempted for 56 of the clients through psychological study, and by providing information on the availability of training opportunities.

In short, the success of any long-range program to reemploy technologically displaced older workers depends on the effectiveness of public training and retraining programs. Information gathered from the client group gives some indication of the view of older workers regarding the value and effectiveness of training.

Of the 72 interviewed in the client group, 47 or 65% reported that they had taken at least one retraining course in the period 1961-1966. Of these 35 or 74% of those who received training said that they were given tests to decide which training course they should take. Table 5 summarizes the attitudes of the 35 workers towards these tests and other methods of training selection.

Table 5.

Worker Appraisal of Measures for Placement in Training Programs

Type of Tests Taken:		
I.Q. [illegible] Manual Dexterity	12	34%
Manual Dexterity	9	26%
General Aptitude	5	14%
I.Q.	4	11%
Literacy	3	9%
N.A.	2	6%
Influence on Placement in Training:		
Aided in placement	14	40%
No influence	13	37%
Indicated abilities	5	14%
Don't know	3	9%
Interviews for Placement in Training:		
Had interview	29	62%
No interview	17	36%
Don't know	1	2%
Influence of Interview on Placement in Training:		
No influence	12	41%
Aided in placement	6	21%
Aided in course selection	6	21%
Indicated abilities	2	6%
Don't know	3	10%

Interesting results are derived from a comparison of these responses with information provided by the Vocational School. The School reports that all trainees are given a general aptitude and dexterity test before enrollment in a training course. Responses as to type of test indicate the majority were aware of these tests, making allowances for equating I.Q. tests with aptitude tests.

On the influence of these tests on placement in training, the School reports that guidance is given trainees on the basis of tests and interviews, but that selection is voluntary. At times, though, the availability of MDTA funds induces the School to place trainees in courses beginning at that time. The answer "indicated abilities" to both the testing and interviewing question meant that the respondent was guided by the tests and interview into a particular training program. The large number who reported that neither test nor interview influenced selection of training program is difficult to explain in that the School advised the workers to take particular courses based on these pre-training devices. Perhaps the workers were not aware they were guided on the basis of the test and interview.

The typical training course ran for 3 months and met about 40 hours a week. Of the 47 who undertook training courses, only 11 dropped out. Of these 7 had not missed a class before dropping out, thus indicating that absenteeism was not an element in failure to finish the course. 5, or almost ½, of the dropouts left the training program to take a job and 3 quit because of poor health. One did not respond and only 2 left because of dissatisfaction with the program.

All but 3 of the 47 who participated in training programs reported that they received financial assistance while in training courses, probably contributing to the very low dropout rate, when 2 who quit to take paying jobs are excluded. It is interesting to note that while the group responded that they averaged about $50 per week, almost as much as they averaged from job earnings when employed, in support from MDTA allowance, welfare, etc. while in training, 30 claimed that this financial support was not sufficient.

Most workers were favorably impressed with the training courses they took, which for the period of the interview had been in building maintenance, janitorial services, and small appliance repair, but their opinions as to the benefits of the course in getting jobs were mized. Table 6 summarizes their attitudes toward the training course taken.

In general, the above data indicate that while the trainees liked the experience of attending the course, and thought their instructors were good (Could this also indicate a reticence to criticize at the personal level?) they thought they might have profited more from a different program and felt that their courses were too simple. Other complaints along this line referred to the courses' being too long and repetitious.

Very significant answers were given to two important questions on the effectiveness of the courses as aids to getting jobs. When asked if retraining aided them in finding employment, 20 said "yes" and 20 "no," the other 7 being uncertain or not responding. But when asked if having completed a training program helped them get the particular job they held, of those responding only 14 said "yes" and 24 "no."

Table 6.

Attitudes Toward Training Course

Did you like the course?		
Very much	8	17%
Pretty well	24	51%
Not much	10	21%
Not at all	4	9%
N.A.	1	2%
Were you in the right course for you?		
Yes	11	23%
No	20	43%
Uncertain	12	25%
N.A.	4	9%
Level of Course:		
Too easy	20	43%
Uncertain	16	34%
About right	5	11%
Too hard	5	11%
N.A.	1	2%
Coverage:		
Too narrow	16	34%
About right	23	49%
Too much	7	15%
N.A.	1	2%
Teacher:		
Excellent	11	23%
Good	25	53%
Average	5	11%
Poor	4	9%
N.A.	2	4%

There are two possible explanations to these seeming inconsistent responses. In some cases, the job currently held was not one for which the worker trained, leading to a negative answer to the second question, but still allowing for a positive answer to the first in that prior jobs could have been in the field of the training program. Another reason for the preponderance of negative responses to the second question was that the workers confused the mechanics of job placement with the technical requirements of the job. The Vocational School does not place workers in jobs, but the Employment Service uses training records in placing workers for specific jobs. Thus, perhaps in some cases the workers were unaware that they were placed because of having completed a training program. They could only judge, perhaps incorrectly, whether the job required the techniques and skills acquired through training. Further, in some cases even if these skills were not actually required, their possession was instrumental in their being referred and hired. For these reasons, there might be a bias toward the workers' underestimating the value of training and/or having completed a training course in getting work.

Repeated dissatisfactions with training reflect the strong condition of the Milwaukee labor market. Many respondents claim that they could get and hold their jobs without training. Further, they are discouraged, while in training, at the prospect of preparing for jobs which pay no more than work requiring no training.

These problems are difficult to overcome unless more of the older workers are trained for jobs requiring more skill and responsibility. Obviously, it is difficult to begin training programs for older workers which will take a long time before skills are learned and developed. Thus it seems that the greatest hope for improving employability of older workers in a tight labor market lies in retraining, or, more exactly, modification of skills of older workers. Most workers were placed in programs that would lead to, at best, semi-skilled work. This was true even of those whose education and existing skills indicated that realignment of skills could be made. In short, training programs could well be designed for equipping older workers, with capability, into new but similar work to which they had been previously trained.

In placement, too, the Employment Service can not only try to induce employers to hire older workers, but can also advise firms to adjust job duties to make use of skills of older clients, when possible. There does not seem to be much discrimination on the basis of age as such in the currently strong labor market, but firms take a long view of training; many older workers could probably have their skills retooled in a relatively short time, especially if firms would bend job requirements somewhat to meet their skills.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Gerald Somers and Graeme McKechnie

The four experimental community projects described in this report are valuable primarily as a demonstration of the special measures required for effective job placement among older workers. Only limited direct economic benefits can be reported. However, some approaches and techniques are found to be more successful than others, and emphasis is given to the importance of proper planning and administration.

A pattern is seen to emerge in the recommendations for improving the effectiveness of future projects. These recommendations, stemming from a careful analysis of the experience in each community, represent a major contribution, and, in themselves, provide a justification for the experimental and demonstration projects.

I. Goals and Plans.

In each of the communities, initial objectives were either wholly abandoned or substantially altered. In the original conception, there was to be a concentration on a specially disadvantaged group, the hard-core unemployed over 50 years of age; and training, primarily on the job, was to be accorded a major role in their labor market rehabilitation. Although there were some variations among the projects, there was a general departure from the original target group and from the proposed training techniques as the community agencies progressed.

Even though almost all of the workers served by the agencies were over 50 and one-fourth were over 60, there is some evidence of "creaming" in their selection. They appeared to have somewhat fewer disadvantages than the universe of unemployed older workers from which they were selected, and in many cases, age was their only labor-market handicap. Nonetheless, most were hard-core unemployed. About one-fourth of those studied were non-white. Over one-third had completed high school, but almost one-half had stopped their formal education in elementary school. Approximately one-third stated that they had recently been prevented from working because of health problems.

In North Carolina, a controversy over goals and target groups developed among the administrative personnel. An original conception of tracking down potential trainees in the most depressed conditions of the rural hills was soon abandoned as impractical, although some continued to urge this effort. In the end, a more likely group of trainee prospects was interviewed, and even so, those actually selected for training were better educated and younger than the average of those interviewed. Finally, the type of training received was very limited, not directly related to labor-market opportunities, let alone the on-the-job requirements of particular employers.

In Baltimore, too, there was a substantial departure from original goals and targets. The program was initially designed to provide subprofessional on-the-job training opportunities in community service agencies. But the assumptions behind this approach proved to be wrong, and the project was changed twice. When it became apparent that older recruits were unwilling to accept menial positions and potential public employers were unwilling to accept the low OJT subsidy-payments, the efforts were turned from public to private employers, and then away from an emphasis on training to simple counselling and job development activities. In the process, much of the original Experimental and Demonstration flavor of the project was lost, greater selectivity developed, and it became essentially an effort to find jobs for workers whose fifty-plus status was their only handicap.

The Boston project also moved from an initial plan for placement, training, and job development to an almost exclusive concentration on placement. As in the other communities, the immediate pressure to find jobs and income for the older-worker clients led to a by-passing of the time-consuming processes of training. Plans for a careful research evaluation were also sidetracked because of the operating agency's necessary absorption in day-to-day placement activities. Although recruitment techniques were efficient and wide-ranging, there was clearly a selective preference for white-collar, better-educated workers, and in spite of the fifty-plus goals of the program, one-fifth of those serviced were between 45 and 49 years of age.

The stated goals of the Milwaukee program were never fully approached. Community agencies, private employers and vocational education institutions were to cooperate in a program of testing as a prelude to training and placement of hard-core unemployed workers displaced because of plant shutdown or relocation. Although tests were administered, they had little relation to any training or job placement which might have later occurred. The project agency did not increase training or job development activities. Tests produced no research results.

A pattern is seen to emerge in each of the communities studied--one of departure from original goals and, to some extent, from original target groups. In the absence of careful pre-planning and tight disciplinary controls over objectives, the pressures of practical needs seem to lead away from more complex, long-range and time-consuming goals such as training, counselling or research evaluation, to an activity with a more immediate payoff: direct job placement. And there is a constant temptation, under these same pressures, to move from selection of the most disadvantaged to concentration on the least disadvantaged workers in the given age category.

The Package of Services

The original conception of the demonstration projects was to combine a package of services to increase the employment of older workers. The contents of the package were to be determined by the needs of the workers selected in each community project, but they were thought likely to include basic education, testing, counselling, training (preferably OJT), job development and job placement through employer contacts. As has been noted, training efforts were generally abandoned, especially on-the-job training. The reasons for this failure cited by the John F. Kennedy Center in Boston are also applicable to the other communities and are significant for the planning of future projects of this type. Essentially, the characteristics of the selected clients were not suited to the OJT openings; the beginning wages and the location of the training slots were not such as to motivate older workers; and just as the older workers considered training to be a questionable investment for themselves, so did potential employers.

In the three large cities the labor market was tight in 1966, and jobs requiring low-level skills could be found for even disadvantaged older workers without extensive training. For better jobs at higher skill levels, the considerable costs of bringing such workers up to satisfactory standards through training were felt to be greater than the limited potential life-time stream of benefits.

In the rural area of North Carolina the training problem was of a different order. Few jobs of any kind were available locally, and the older workers were not likely to move for employment. Insisting on carrying out initial training plans under these circumstances resulted in such non-market oriented courses as cooking and sewing. Courses in basic adult education were found to be necessary for a number of the older worker clients, and they proved to be popular. Basic education might well have been expanded as one of the project's major contributions. Literacy training accorded benefits in its own right, but it was not used as a base for further job-oriented training.

Just as disappointing as the departure from training plans in these projects was the limited impact of job-oriented testing and counseling. Only in Milwaukee was there a substantial amount of testing, and this was oriented toward experimentation with the testing process rather than toward labor-market activity. When some of these workers later entered MDTA courses they were given the customary GATB tests rather than any modification which might have stemmed from the test experimentation. Aptitutde tests were given to a small group of workers in the North Carolina project as a prelude to their entry into training in the sewing course. It was found that those tested, with limited education and ability, experienced difficulty in following directions in a modified test battery. Here, too, little progress was made in adapting conventional tests to the needs of older workers.

Skilled counseling could be expected to play a major role in projects designed to foster employment for disadvantaged older workers. As is generally recognized, and substantiated in these case studies, unemployed older workers frequently lack the motivation to seek training and employment, and they are often unaware of the requirements and procedures of job-seeking. Employment-oriented counseling faced a challenging opportunity in these projects. Unfortunately, this type of counseling seems to have had relatively small participation in the package of services.

Although counseling interviews were conducted in the North Carolina project, the advice given was primarily concerned with the clients' personal problems and with information about medical and community welfare services. Similarly in interviews with the nonprofessional group in Boston and in the initial phases of the Baltimore project, counseling took the form of personal and welfare advice and referral. Although counseling of this type may be a prerequisite to the labor-market rehabilitation of hard-core unemployed workers, it may contribute little to employment success unless followed up with advice directed to labor-market preparation and information.

Labor-market oriented counseling in Baltimore was widely used only in furthering the self-help activities of the relatively skilled Talents Group. Although project officials there and in Boston felt that they had engaged in considerable counseling, realtively few of the workers indicated that they had received or benefited from counseling. This discrepancy was partly a definitional problem, but in view of the workers' reaction it can only be assumed that much of the counseling was ineffective in guiding workers to employment opportunities. There is evidence that the limited contribution of counseling, in Baltimore at least, stemmed from the inexperience of the project staff. It is reported that the effectiveness of counseling improved greatly in the final phase of that project. Most notable in this improvement was an increased awareness of labor-market needs and opportunities in relation to the worker's qualifications and potentialities. An increasing effort was made to relate the characteristics of particular clients to the requirements of specific job openings. Thus counseling was increasingly meshed with job development and placement.

It was in their job development activities that the project staffs in Baltimore and Boston showed the greatest energy and ingenuity. Even in tight labor markets, employers have to be sold on the hiring of older workers, and there is an important role for third-party intervention on behalf of job-seekers in their effort to make contact with potential jobs. Job development in Baltimore went through three, increasingly sophisticated phases: first, there was a general job search for primarily unskilled openings in public and other non-profit community service agencies. Although 363 job opportunities were developed only 13 workers were actually placed. A somewhat higher placement ratio was achieved when the second phase moved to general job development in the private business and industrial community. In the final phase, specific jobs at an increasingly more skilled level were sought for individual, better-qualified applicants in private industry.

The Boston project's job development specialist contacted over 300 local firms either in person or by mail, explained the Older Worker Project, and solicited openings. For the more skilled Talents Group, the JFK Center followed up want ads through the mail and, by enclosing resumes and other information, attempted to convince employers of the value of hiring particular older workers to meet their employment needs. This mailing service was considered to be especially effective and was later extended to all applicants.

In spite of these job development activities and the subsequent concentration on job placement, it cannot be said that the placement services of the Baltimore and Boston projects were notably successful. (The Milwaukee and North Carolina projects were responsible for almost no job development or placement activities). Even though the counseling, development and placement functions were carried out with increasing sophistication in Baltimore, the relatively low proportion of placements to developed job opportunities remained essentially the same in the last two phases of the project--an especially disappointing outcome in view of the growing tightness of the labor market and the higher caliber of selected applicants toward the project's end. In both Baltimore and Boston, a substantial number of older applicants who had contacted the project agencies were self-placed, with little or no measurable aid from the agency. There is little evidence that the self-placed fared less-well in the labor market than those who were serviced by the concentrated job development and placement activites of the projects. Of course it may well be that the workers who benefited from these services were hard to place and that they would have had much less success without agency assistance.

Employment and Income Effects

The individual case studies contain a great deal of useful information on the employment and income experience of the older-worker clients following the services obtained in the community projects. In each case, the research investigator has attempted to assess the labor-market benefits of the program by comparing clients' experience with a "control" group. Follow-up data were obtained through extensive interview and mail questionnaire surveys. In Buncombe County, North Carlina, the interview data for the selected trainees were compared with earlier information obtained from interviews with the larger number applicants for project assistance. In Milwaukee, clients who had participated in the testing program were compared with a small number of unemployed older workers who had not been referred to the project by the Employment Service because they were not laid off as a result of plant shutdown or relocation. Comparisons in Baltimore were made between those who were directly placed on jobs by the project agency, those who were indirectly placed (clients who found their own jobs) and those who were not placed. Similarly in Boston the "self-placed" clients of the JFK Center were compared with those placed by the Center.

Unfortunately the "control" groups were not identical with the study groups in the characteristics of importance for labor-market success, and so the results of these comparisons could not provide conclusive evidence concerning the impact of particular services of the community projects. The relatively small samples and the workers' problems of recalling employment and income experience also prevent a conclusive economic evaluation.

These methodological limitations notwithstanding, these careful research evaluations offer little conclusive evidence of significant economic gains in employment or income that can be attributed specifically to the projects themselves. In North Carolina, only four of the 31 trainees had jobs related to their training, and this is not surprising in view of the fact that the training courses were not job-oriented. There is evidence that those who enrolled in training were in the least need of training. Many of the hard-core unemployed had been bypassed. The employment and income effects of basic education, counseling and other services could not be detected.

Although almost two-thirds of those tested in the Milwaukee project took a government-sponsored training course, there is no evidence that the project activity resulted in their enrolment in the training programs or that the project was responsible for their subsequent labor-market experience. Thus the follow-up data on the Milwaukee workers offers an interesting perspective on older-worker employment problems and training programs rather than an evaluation of the NCOA community project. Although the interviewed workers had improved their employment position relative to their pre-project status in 1964, those who had not been referred to the project did as well in employment and income as the project clients. The unemployment rate of the client group (15 percent) was still five times the area rate in 1966. And with over-two thirds earning less that $1 per hour, many of them were at least as well off when receiving their training stipends of approximately $50 per week.

In Baltimore, 54 percent of the sample were employed when interviewed in the third quarter of 1966, but Indirect Placements had a slightly higher rate (70 percent) than Direct Placements, with a low of 42 percent among those not placed. No conclusive distinctions were found between the earnings of those employed prior to their current status and the earnings of those employed at the time of the follow-up interview survey. However, 59 percent of those employed at the time of interview earned over $65 per week compared with 42 percent of the earlier employed group above this earnings level.

The JFK Center in Boston placed 36.1 percent of its applicants directly and at the time of the follow-up survey, almost 70 percent of the JFK-placed were working full or part-time, compared with almost 75 percent of the self-placed. Less than 40 percent of the JFK-placed were still on the JFK job, however. The self-placed were concentrated more in white-collar jobs, and their mean earnings were $23 per week above the mean for the JFK-placed. A wealth of data on occupations and earnings and training for the two groups in Boston are available, but as in the other communities, no conclusive evidence is established for the specific economic contribution of the community project.

Attitudes and Evaluations of the Workers

The subjective evaluation on the part of project clients is a major contribution of the case-study appraisals of these community projects. Generalization in this concluding section runs the danger of doing violence to the detailed tabulations in the individual reports. On the whole, however, it can be concluded that the clients were pleased with their experience in the projects and with the project staffs, but in keeping with the objective findings, they were less certain about the contribution the projects made to their employment and income.

Questions designed to appraise applicant motivations found variations with respect to communities and interview samples. The most serious reservations regarding employment attitudes were found among the rural group in North Carolina. But here, as elsewhere, there was some evidnece that motivation for entry into employment-creating projects was closely linked to the secure prospect of obtaining a decent job at the end of the road. Counselling was criticized as not being sufficiently geared to specific job availability. Training was viewed as less helpful when jobs available without training paid as well as training-related employment. Similarly, job placement activity was appraised by the workers in terms of the comparative openings they could obtain on their own or through the assistance of the regular Employment Service.

Thus, by and large, the older worker clients were grateful for the efforts of the community projects, but they adopted a hard-headed approach to the evaluation of project contributions to their welfare. Whether in the depressed area of Buncombe County or in the thriving metroplitan communities, the workers had to be convinced that their status was enhanced by project services, beyond the level they themselves could achieve in the absence of such services. And this, after all, is a legitimate criteria for any evaluation of manpower policies.

Attitudes and Evaluations of Employers

Some evidence on employer reactions to the community projects were obtained in Baltimore and Boston as part of the total evaluation. They are generally quite favorable. In Baltimore, employers who had requested information on the project all stated that the services were effective or satisfactory. Most of the employer representatives felt that older workers compared favorably with other workers; and 88 percent said the older workers could perform the type of work they had been hired to do.

In Boston, the employers were somewhat more mixed in their reaction to the project and to the desirability of hiring older workers. Those who had not hired applicants referred to them by the JFK Center cited such reasons as their low level of aptitutde, stability and physical ability. In explaining the separation of employees from JFK-placed jobs in their establishments, employers cited their physical inability to do the work and their mental incapability among other reasons. In suggestions for improvement of the project services, they stressed improved contacts with employers and better counseling and training.

Costs and Benefits

The methodological problems which customarily beset cost-benefit analysis of manpower programs are compounded in the evaluation of the four community projects.* Although rough, aggregate cost data are available, in the sense of federal allocation and expenditures in each of the community projects, there are serious difficulties in determining per capita costs. Should these be established on the basis of cost per client contact, per counseling interview, per direct placement, per indirect or self-placement? While some of the clients obtained extensive services, involving a substantial amount of personnel time and that of training instructors, others did little more than fill out an application form. And yet some of the casual contacts were placed on jobs or placed themselves, and some of those who received extensive services were not placed. Obviously the per capita costs rise or fall depending on the choice of these alternative inclusions.

---

*These methodological problems are similar to those described in detail in an earlier report prepared for NCOA: G. Somers, Evaluation of Work Experience and Training of Older Workers, Industrial Relations Research, Institute, University of Wisconsin, 1967.

Similarly, there is a problem in determining the appropriate costs to include. Should prior or ancillary services be included, such as the ABCD program in Boston which preceded and was later incorporated in the JFK Center? Should the cost of the community agencies' self-assessment in Baltimore and Boston be included, even though it followed the final placement? Should the costs of MDTA or OJT training be included (if they could be determined on an older-worker-project basis) even though these services were provided outside of the project agencies' staff? Should the costs of the test experimentation in Milwaukee be included even though the results were not used to aid training or placement?

Alternative per capita cost estimates, based on assumptions described in detail in the individual evaluations were made in Baltimore and Boston. In Baltimore, the average cost per client (applicant) is placed between $92 and $120, and the cost per job placement ranges from $380 if indirect placements are included to $850 if only direct placements are included. In Boston, depending on the assumptions made concerning inclusion and exclusion, the estimated cost per client ranged from $141 to $178; and cost per placement ranged from $213 to $594. In Milwaukee the cost was $122 per person tested, but substantial additional costs were incurred by other agencies for those who were later assigned to MDTA training.

The determination of the benefits is plagued by even more unsurmountable difficulties. Because the research evaluation was an after thought, appropriate employment and income data records were not maintained, and the samples of interviewees who provided such data in the follow-up evaluation were seldom a completely accurate representation of the total clients served. More important, the financial resources available for each community evaluation were not sufficient to permit the acquisition of comparable interview data from a valid control group. Such a group would be similar to the clients served in each project except that they received none of the project services. The benefit evaluation must determine what would have happened in the absence of the program. Such a comparison is especially important in these studies because the employment picture brightened considerably between 1960 and 1966, and the very tight labor market achieved in the large cities by 1966 would permit a favorable before-after employment comparison for most older workers, regardless of their participation in the community projects.

In Boston and Baltimore, it was necessary to compare those directly placed by the project agency with clients who were indirectly placed, self-placed or not placed. The personal characteristics of these groups differed, and since all had received some project services, the comparison could not provide a measure of benefits based on a "with-and-without project" comparison. No follow-up data were available for the comparison group in North Carolina, and the absence of clearly-defined project services as well as the small control group used in the Milwaukee evaluation renders any benefit calculation there hazardous.

For these reasons, an effort to arrive at a precise cost-benefit ratio or other precise measures of cost-benefit evaluation would be fruitless and misleading. However, the data on costs and the wage and employment data contained in the individual reports, when coupled with subjective client and employer reactions, provide a basis for general inference.

There is no reason to conclude that the North Carolina and Milwaukee projects produced direct employment and income benefits for their clients. Although the costs of these projects were relatively small, they were not offset by demonstrable economic gains. The possible benefits are not presently measureable--the satisfactions derived from literacy training, the consumption benefits of cooking and sewing classes, the potential gains of experimentation in testing, the possible awareness leading to future training or employment, derived from contact with the projects.

In Baltimore and Boston the costs were more substantial. As a result of project services, jobs were probably found for some disadvantaged older workers which might otherwise have not been forthcoming. But for most of the clients there is no evidence that the costs incurred resulted in offsetting employment and income gains, beyond those that might have been achieved in the absence of the projects.

The basic rationale and the great opportunity of the projects was the provision of a unique package of labor-market services for unemployed older workers--services.not available through the Employment Service or other sources. The subjective evaluations of clients and employers indicate that this opportunity was largely missed. There was some evidence that the services improved as greater experience was gained toward the end of the Baltimore and Boston projects. This bodes well for a continuation of these projects. But most of the clients covered in these case studies passed through the programs too early to benefit from the acquired experience. They appreciated the kindness and sincere efforts of the project personnel but could not attribute labor-market gains to these efforts.

In part, these results reflect the grave difficulties facing attempts to find jobs for disadvantaged workers over 50 years of age. However, other studies have shown that it is possible to motivate, counsel, train, and place older workers, giving them economic benefits which they would not otherwise enjoy. And other experimental and demonstration projects for the hard-core unemployed have had more favorable economic results. It is instructive to give further thought to the reasons for the limited economic benefits of the older worker projects.

A Retrospective View of Planning and Administration

All of the community research investigators lay the principal drawbacks at the doorstep of initial planning and project administration.

In common with many community action programs, there were serious delays in implementing the projects after initial agreement. The delays were aggravated because in addition to the Labor Department contract with the prime contractor, the NCOA, there was need to establish or gain the cooperation of a local community agency, and there were inevitable problems of committee recruitment and coordination of proposals and plans. The delays had harmful morale-disturbing effects everywhere, but they were especially disastrous in Buncombe County, North Carolina. The causes of the delays are not easy to pinpoint but they appear to be well distributed across the three echelons of administration of the projects.

Plans and goals were not sufficiently thought out. Further exploration of the target population and the labor-market and community possibilities--perhaps smaller pilot programs--should have preceded the major contracts. The lack of foresight in the Buncombe County plan is especially noticeable. Conflict over goals developed, and certain goals were abandoned without sufficient cause, largely in response to pressures for immediate results. In some cases, the goals were never clear.

Cooperation with the Employment Service, vocational educators, other community agencies, and especially, employers was not arranged in advance or was not maintained throughout the projects. Without such cooperation efforts at job placement of disadvantaged workers have little hope for success.

The staff of the community agencies was insufficiently experienced in handling the employment problems of older workers; and the NCOA staff, which might have provided such expertise, was apparently too limited to contribute much. Only toward the end of the Baltimore and Boston projects was sufficient experience gained to provide effective labor-market services.

The gains to be derived from experience apply to the project administration as a whole. The concept of expert NCOA intervention between the Labor Department and an inexperienced (in older worker affairs) community agency is a useful one. However, there were separate OMPER contracts with NCOA and each of the agencies. This reduced the effectiveness of NCOA control over direction of the projects. Future arrangements of this type will undoubtedly benefit from the demonstration effects of the first attempts. As a result of this experience, NCOA negotiated a contract with OEO so that the funds for 12 community projects came into NCOA. NCOA then selected the communities and had some say over the direction of the local projects.

Recommendations

The major value of these demonstration projects for the training and placement of older workers lies not in their direct economic benefits. The value lies in the recommendations derived from these initial experiences for improved projects in the future. After all, this is what E & D is all about. Detailed recommendations are contained in the individual reports. They can be summarized briefly as follows:

1. Plans and goals must be based on a more careful analysis of the older worker population and needs, as well as the labor-market demand and possibilities for cooperation in each community. Goals should be clear, agreed to by all cooperating parties, and adhered to in the absence of compelling reasons to the contrary.

2. Cooperation and agreement on goals and procedures should be clearly established with the Employment Service, vocational educators, community agencies and, especially, employers, before the project is initiated. It is important to form a committee of employers who will help guide the project and agree to accept trainees and job placements.

3. The NCOA should play a more active role in providing expertise in older workers' problems to the community agencies charged with local project administration. N.C.O.A. would be in a position to have greater control over the direction of the local project if funds for the community agency were allocated through NCOA.

4. Training programs require prior basic education in some cases, and larger stipends to both trainees and OJT employers to provide motivation and incentive. The type and duration of training should be geared to client qualifications and labor-market possibilities.

5. A multi-service package, including testing, counselling, basic education, training, job development, and placement should be provided; the package composition for each client being determined by his peculiar needs and employment potentialities. There is reason to believe that training is less attractive to older workers and to their potential employers than other components of the package. However, studies have shown that MDTA-type training can be economically advantageous for many older workers, and it should not be ruled out in a multi-service employment program.